

### Debris Consultation Summary

SECTOR	CONCERNS	RESPONSE
Natural Gas Producers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of proactive approach to debris management</li> <li>• Concerns of potential enforcement even with works approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. MELP will have tools to prevent introduction of debris before it occurs.</li> <li>• Enforcement is last resort if other attempts to remedy debris are not successful.</li> </ul>
BC Hydro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WUPs include consideration of maintenance or construction in and around reservoirs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally Agree. However, where specific activities not included, then can be handled by approvals, but activities not covered by WUP or approvals would be subject to debris provisions.</li> </ul>
Mining	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why the need for this provision, there is adequate legislation currently in place.</li> <li>• The Mining Exploration Code should provide the same exemptions as the FPC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The debris provisions provide proactive tools to prevent the introduction of debris into streams and are potential gap fillers.</li> <li>• The LGIC will have the authority to provide other exemptions than the FPC, to be based on established track records.</li> </ul>
Independent Forest Land Owners, Truck Loggers, BC Federation of Woodlot Assoc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Private Forest Landowners Reg. includes references to debris management, but does not have same exemption as FPC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. Activities of sector will be monitored to determine overall compliance and future regulatory needs.</li> </ul>
Council of Forest Industries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have no concerns as exemption from debris provisions is inherent in the FPC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree.</li> </ul>
IWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No concern in general with debris provisions as long as there is no impact on forest workers.</li> <li>• Some concern that the debris provisions may provide third party with opportunity to disrupt forest industry activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. The FPC regulated activities are exempted from the debris provisions.</li> <li>• Disagree. Third parties do not have standing to appeal manager decisions.</li> </ul>

Outdoor Recreation Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over potential conflict of kayaks and fishers on streams.</li> <li>• Must it be proven that damage has been done?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. No immediate policy in place to address.</li> <li>• Debris provisions can provide proactive and reactive action, and require remediation where appropriate.</li> </ul>
Agriculture Council, BC Cattlemen's Association and other industry members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support debris provisions where they address potential impacts on irrigation system infeeds.</li> <li>• Prescribed best agricultural practices should be exempt from debris provisions.</li> <li>• There should be a right of appeal on manager decisions.</li> <li>• There are too many regulations now, this is a duplication of DFO legislation.</li> <li>• Farmers must have approval to respond quickly to weather and flood damage to streams and riparian zones to prevent erosion of banks and farmland.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree.</li> <li>• Agree. Environmental Appeal Board process is applicable.</li> <li>• Disagree. The debris provisions are intended as a gapfiller, where other agencies cannot or will not deal with debris situation. Also provides provincial government with proactive toolbox.</li> <li>• Agree. Debris provisions do not prohibit this remedial work.</li> </ul>