

# CRWS Project Team Meeting Notes

**Date:** May 02, 2007  
**Time:** 9:00 pm – 3:00 pm  
**Location:** FVRD, Cheam Boardroom

---



**Facilitator:** Marion Robinson, Fraser Basin Council

**Present:** Krista Englund, Fraser Valley Regional District/Watersheds Coalition  
Lance Lilley, Fraser Valley Regional District  
Mark Johnson, Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
David Barnes, Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Tom Cadieux, Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Bob Stanton, Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
David Lamson, Electoral Area E Representative, CRAC  
Sylvia Letay, BC Ministry of Environment  
Jack Mussell, Skwah First Nation  
(David Kiess, IPP Association of BC – only for IPP Presentation)  
(Scott Babakaiff, MOE Fish Protection Hydrologist – only for IPP Presentation)

---

The meeting commenced at 9:20 pm.

## 1.0 Acceptance of Agenda

---

The Agenda for the meeting was reviewed and accepted as written, except with an amendment to move the discussion about “next steps” from the next meeting to today.

## 2.0 Review of March meeting notes and ACTION ITEMS

---

The minutes from the April 11, 2007 CRWS meeting were accepted as written.

Update of April meeting ACTION ITEMS:

- **ACTION ITEM** (carried over) Project Team to discuss the possibility of holding a workshop on invasive species in the Chilliwack River Watershed in the future.
  - Ministry of Forests is planning on hosting an invasive species workshop at some point this summer, which may be an opportunity for CRWS.
  - Follow-up ACTION ITEM: Lance to follow-up with Allan Johnsrude (MOFR) about the workshop being open initiation or not, and if milfoil and other non-forest related invasive species within the watershed can/will be included in workshop proceedings.

- **ACTION ITEM** (carried over) Krista/Lance to investigate the potential for obtaining additional funding from the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds program to support an outreach and implementation phase.
  - Krista is planning to send a letter to the Pacific Salmon Foundation within the next few days. Marion recommended that Jennifer Bratty at Fraser Basin Council be included in funding communications.
- **ACTION ITEM 1:** Lance to look into when the mineral tenure over the Chipmunk Caves expires (and who the holder is).
  - There are two existing overlapping mineral tenures over Chipmunk Caves. One expires in March 2008, the other on May 4, 2007.
  - Complicating the issue however is that MOE currently holds an aggregate tenure over the caves, but has not extracted any materials yet because of the required compensation owed to the mineral tenure holders. Therefore, placing a Mineral Reserve on the site may prevent mining activity, but could actually contribute to aggregate removal.
  - Email discussions with Joe MacInnes (of MOE) suggested that MOE would possibly support a transfer in tenure for environmental protection.
- **ACTION ITEM 2:** Krista/Lance to discuss Integrated Community Sustainability Planning funding options with Siri/David.
  - Lance discussed the issue with David Urban (FVRD Planning), and it does not look possible to include CRWS funding as part of FVRD's application for Integrated Community Sustainability Planning. Each local government can only submit one application, and the FVRD's application is for implementation of their Regional Growth Strategy.

### **3.0 Update on Soowahlie First Nation representation**

Francis Mussell, a newly elected Councilor with the Soowahlie First Nation, will be serving on the CRWS Project Team as a Soowahlie representative (a position formally held by Nelson Kahama). The Project Team welcomes Francis to the process, and looks forward to his future contributions.

It was also recommended that CRWS establish communications with, and seek contributions from, the newly elected Soowahlie Chief, Ms. Joanne Armstrong.

### **4.0 Acceptance of previously presented Issues and Alternatives Reports**

The Project Team discussed how Project Team "approval" should be granted or assumed for previously presented Issues and Alternatives Reports (e.g., Habitat Restoration, Mining, etc.).

One recommendation was to require each report be approved by a minimum number of Project Team members (2 were suggested). Members tentatively signed up to review, to provide comments, and to “sign-off” on prior reports as follows:

- Fishing Behaviour: Tom
- Illegal Dumping: Tom
- Restoration: Sylvia
- Invasive Species: Dave B.
- Mining: (no takers)
- Residential and Commercial Development: Mark, Dave L.
- River Hazards: Sylvia, Dave L.

Group members agreed to send comments to Lance by May 22 to allow him enough time to make the required edits prior to the end of his current contract on June 12, 2007.

Another recommendation was to include within the Strategy a requirement for periodic review and updating so that the report remains a living document and continually evolving.

Tom commented that he would prefer to review reports in hard copy, and that a binder prepared of all reports to-date and distributed to Project Team members would ease review.

## **5.0 Next Steps/Overall Strategy Review**

---

Krista discussed how she envisions further progress on the Strategy:

- Project Team provides a review of each document
  - The Issues and Alternatives Reports need to be drafted by the time funding for the Watershed Assistant runs out (projected for June 12, 2007).
  - A consultant can be hired to prepare a glossy 30-40 page report to become the “Strategy”. This is envisioned as including a brief section of the origins of the process, a short spread on each issue, and a Looking Forward section.
- A package that includes this “Strategy” as well as each Issues and Alternatives Report will then be sent out for public and key agency review (expected for Fall, 2007).
- Project Team can then discuss comments, implementation, next steps, etc. in the fall.

It was recommended that the final Strategy include an “open chapter” that will allow inclusion of new issues and concerns as they arise. This will help ensure that the Strategy remain a living document and current. A subsequent recommendation was to include within the Strategy a requirement for periodic review and updating.

Two new issues were introduced by members of the Project Team:

1. Private property rights with respect to erosion/accretion along riverfront properties in the Valley - this issue might fit into an existing report (e.g., Residential Development or Crown Land Management), or listed at the end of the Strategy as an outstanding issue.
2. Water licenses – this is partially dealt with in the IPP report, but a summary can be included about current water rights and water licenses issued within the Valley (possibly within Crown Land Management section).

Based on limited time and resources, the Project Team was asked to prioritize remaining issues in case they cannot all be adequately addressed before current funding expires. Recreation and Forestry were identified as key issues in the watershed that should be included. If required, remaining issues could be dealt with in the Fall. Issues that have not yet had substantial stakeholder participation can be drafted anyway, with the primary recommendation that additional public consultation be required to adequately address the issue.

## **6.0 Review of River Hazards Issues and Alternatives Report**

---

Krista lead a discussion about the River Hazards Issues and Alternatives Report. This discussion included the following points and suggestions for revisions or additions to this report:

### **General:**

- Include recreation/human use as an example of when natural conditions become hazards
- Issue is not the presence or absence of LWD – it is the location of LWD that is relevant with respect to hazards
- We should use the Strategy as an opportunity to introduce the public to scientific terminology (e.g., fluvial processes, hyporheic zones, etc) – and then possibly include a glossary within the final Strategy as an Appendix.
- We should reference Watershed Restoration Program Technical Circulars #8 and #9 that specifically pertain to LWD
- The red tape/bureaucracy pertaining to log removal should be captured within the report
- Bridges are the ‘pinch points’ along the river which restrict water passage and lead to downstream impacts – therefore if we want bridges to have wider crossings we need to have discussions with appropriate agencies (e.g., Ministry of Highways)
- Include specific examples when appropriate in order to make more of a connection between the reader and the issue (e.g., for impacts on species-at-risk, mention Chinook; for dredging impacts, mention crayfish, etc.)

### **Specific Locations:**

- There is a significant debris jam at Thurston Meadows
- Allison Pool serves as a collector of logs – but most of the logs are gone currently

### **Contributing Factors:**

- Frustration at the local government level is very significant
  - individual property owners become responsible for their own property impacts (doing own technical studies, etc) – how can we help them?
  - Lack of funding for maintenance usually left to Electoral Area & residents. Increasing funds (via a property tax) can only be raised by public referendum, which are a very hard sell because not all communities are threatened by flooding by the same degree – leads to tremendous tension between communities.
- References could be added following each bullet to allow readers to find further information if they would like.
- Landscape-level impacts (landslides, etc) could be listed within contributing factors to make sure they are captured within the report.

**Vision:**

- Change to read “... and coordinated approach that avoids or minimizes impacts...”
- Replace “communities and transportation corridors” with “infrastructure”
- Delete “(e.g. fish and fish habitat)”
- Change to read “... impacts to and/or enhances ecological and social values”

**Goals:**

- #2 – broaden to include ecological processes

**Recommendations:**

- #3 – include First Nation on list with MOU
- #3 – Regulatory agencies will be very reluctant to sign an MOU locking them in to a specific course of action – therefore the MOU (or another potential term) should speak to the process and to steps taken to simplify the approval/referral process.
- #4 – An inter-agency management body should be called an “Advisory Committee” (versus a “Management Committee”) since they would likely not be delegated authority.

## **7.0 Independent Power Producers (IPP) Presentation**

---

David Kiess, of the IPP Association of BC, gave a presentation to the Project Team on IPP projects in BC and the state of the industry. It was a very interesting and informative presentation, and the Project Team was very appreciative of David’s time and efforts in giving the presentation and in answering the many questions the group had about IPPs.

## **8.0 IPP Discussion for Drafting Issues and Alternatives Report**

---

The Project Team discussed the issue of IPPs in order to help the drafting of the IPP Issues and Alternatives Report. Some of the comments mentioned included:

- Bill 30 took away local governments’ zoning regulation for IPPs.
- IPPs generally do not trigger BC EAA, but do trigger CEAA if on a Navigable Water.
- Potential recommendations:
  - assessment be done on any project, irregardless of size
  - alternates to IPPs be researched further (e.g., solar, wind, etc.)
- We need to capture in the report the need to reduce energy consumption.
- An even bigger-picture issue related to IPPs is the privatization of water rights throughout BC – issue of water licenses within CRV should be captured in report.
- Suggestions for Vision:
  - Not allow any IPPs in Chilliwack
  - IPPs can be allowed only when proper assessments are conducted and no significant negative environmental impacts will be incurred
  - IPPs can be allowed, but only under agreements that the energy be used locally and not sold to the US

- It was recommended that Scott Babakaiff, the MOE Fish Protection Hydrologist, provide assistance on the document. **ACTION ITEM:** Sylvia to ask Scott if he would be willing to help on the document or to talk to the group about potential impacts.
- It was also recommended that Vince Busto of DFO might also be a useful person, if available, to review the report.
- The Project Team considered bringing in someone from an area with existing IPPs (e.g., Brandywine River) to discuss what impacts they had noticed in their watershed.

## **9.0 Review of Development (Residential, etc) Issues and Alternatives Report**

---

This discussion was deferred until the next meeting.

## **10.0 Next Meeting, Action Items, & Adjournment**

---

The next meeting was tentatively set for:

- Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2007
- Time: 9:00am-2:00pm (end-time uncertain)
- Location: FVRD Cheam Boardroom
- Tentative topics:
  - Remaining Issues and Alternatives Documents:
    - Recreational and Commercial Development
    - Hatchery Production/Fisheries Management
    - IPPs
    - Recreational Use
    - Forest Management
    - Cultural Approaches
  - Next Steps

Summary of Action Items:

- **ACTION ITEM 1:** Lance to follow-up with Allan Johnsrude (MOFR) about the workshop:
  - Is it open invitations? (i.e., can we advertise the workshop to the community?)
  - Is there a possibility that we can add milfoil and other non-forest related invasive species within the watershed to workshop proceedings?
- **ACTION ITEM 2:** Sylvia to ask Scott if he would be willing to help on the IPP document or to talk to the group about potential impacts.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

---