

From: Bernhard Weiss [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 6:08 PM
To: northinfo
Cc: Donna Tuele
Subject: APC review of the RAR application on Hornby

Dear Alex, Grant, Mrs. Fast,

I need to express my frustration with the outcome of the review.

Having been one of the property owners most affected, I believe that the HILTC did not communicate clearly to the APC what the issues were. The Regulation is a provincial requirement and as such not changeable by the LTC. So the written part of the Hornby bylaws is not the problem, but the identification of rain puddles and their outflow, as well as all man-made drainages like roadside ditches by the Mimulus Report are the problem. The Madrone report has no roadside ditches included at all. The ditch along Savoie Road is a channelised stream with a setback of 2m as per Regulation 3.6.5 and identified as such by Madrone. The man made ditch in front of my property is assigned a default 30m setback by Michelle Jones of Mimulus and a 8m setback by the bylaws.....does not make sense at all, a 8m setback does not exist in the regulations. Man made ditches without fish have a 2m setback, see page 47 of the RAR Assessment Methods https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/plants-animals-and-ecosystems/fish-fish-habitat/riparian-areas-regulations/rar_assessment_methods.pdf .

There are many more man made drainages (some 6" wide and 1" deep) identified as fish bearing streams by Mimulus.

Myself and Donna/ Ron Tuele had asked to review this nonsense stream identifications in the Mimulus Report. There are few issues with the Madrone Report (maybe the stream dead-ending in the forest should be taken out). I would like to remind the LTC, that former Trustees have recognised the problems, but cited "lack of funds" to correct the problem.

Just to drive home the message, that the requirements of the RAR are overbearing and somewhat ridiculous, here is a quote from the latest detailed RAR assessment done to my knowledge on Hornby, it is part of the housing DP application, done by QEP Kayt Chambers. Here we go:

" The fish-bearing status of Beulah Creek is unclear. There are no official records of fish-presence listed for Beulah Creek in the provincial Fish Inventories Data Queries (FIDQ) database , although a regional fish habitat atlas indicates Beulah Creek is fish-bearing (but there is no data source given for this designation). There are anecdotal reports that Cutthroat trout were present in this system in the past, as well as historical spawning attempts by Coho salmon⁶ , but no official records for these have been found. The fish-bearing status of the secondary drainages along this segment of Beulah Creek were previously described by RPBio Michelle Jones as improbable given the relatively steep channel gradients and seasonal flows . Further, DFO has coordinated a salmon hatchery enhancement program for Beulah Creek in which Chum fry have been released in to Beulah Creek on numerous occasions in the past⁸ , but there is no record of these fish returning to spawn. Finally, five Gee-traps were baited for salmonids and set overnight on May 21, 2011 in the subject segment of Beulah Creek as part of the first RAR assessment for this property, but no fish were caught." Given, that the main Beulah Creek stream has no reported fish presence, how about all the little ditches and drainages?

One other question, why is the Maud Brook drainage system (according to historical reports the most prolific Hornby salmon stream) not even considered to be a RAR affected system?

Since I had thrown in my hat for an APC appointment specifically because of the RAR review, I wonder why I was not officially informed that my volunteer effort was not needed.

Sincerely

Bernhard Weiss