



# A NEW DIRECTION FOR STRATEGIC LAND USE PLANNING IN BC

---

## SYNOPSIS



**Integrated Land Management Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture and Lands  
December, 2006**

# SYNOPSIS

## A NEW DIRECTION FOR STRATEGIC LAND USE PLANNING IN BC

**VISION:** A new strategic land use planning program that is flexible and responsive to current and emerging government goals and priorities, including its commitment to a New Relationship with First Nations.

### 1.0 SUMMARY:

This paper proposes a new direction for a strategic land use planning program that reflects current and emerging government goals and priorities. It describes the evolution of strategic land use planning in BC and the current status of completed plans in BC. It identifies factors impacting land use planning in BC, including the benefits, costs and risks associated with land use planning and emerging business drivers.

Over 85% of the provincial Crown land base is covered by 26 regional land use plans and LRMPs, including the 4 requiring final G2G negotiations. There are also 102 SRMPs completed and a remaining 93 plans underway, for a total of 195.

While recent studies show the benefits of strategic planning (e.g., improved communication and inter-agency cooperation; increased involvement of FNs; increased land use certainty for industry; and new legislative tools to benefit threatened and endangered species and improve wildlife habitat), there are also high costs and limited resources available. In addition to the cost and resource issues, land use planning is also now being impacted by other emerging business drivers including: New Relationship commitments; effects of major environmental change; increased exploration and development activities; new federal government initiatives; and new legislation and policies (e.g., FRPA).

A risk assessment conducted for strategic planning ranked risks in three principle areas: plan design; plan process; and planning technique. Proposed actions for mitigation of these three areas of risk are intended to inform a new planning framework.

The proposed new direction reflects discussion of six key questions that have been raised by agencies, the public, industry, interest group and FNs:

1. Completed plans: Do we need to update and monitor them and if so, what structures, mechanisms and priorities should we use?
2. Legacy LRMPs: How do we expedite government decisions for the remaining LRMPs and complete the follow-up work required?
3. FRPA planning requirements: How do we honour our current commitments to complete legislated FRPA planning while addressing new planning pressures?
4. New strategic plans: Should we do new strategic plans and if so, what are the circumstances, priorities, processes and products?
5. First Nations: What framework and processes do we use to address the New Relationship commitments to strategic land use planning with FNs?

6. Funding and staffing: How do we allocate resources to meet the new planning direction and the associated government priorities?

A number of recommendations were made in response to an analysis of these questions. These recommendations were approved by the ILMB Board of Directors, and are now directions. These directions will become the subject of an implementation plan, developed by ILMB with assistance of other agencies and approved by the Board. The implementation plan will become the basis for development of the necessary tools, templates and procedures to establish a planning program that reflects new strategic planning direction.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND:**

### **2.1 Strategic Land Use Planning**

Strategic land use planning (SLUP) is the process and associated outcomes that provide direction for the management and allocation of public lands and resources (both coastal/marine and terrestrial) over a defined area (usually a large area, based on large administrative boundaries, First Nations' (FNs) traditional territories, marine inlets or ecosystems, or large watersheds, or some combination of these units). This includes both regional plans (Land and Resource Management Plans or LRMPs and Sustainable Resource Management Plans or SRMPs). Strategic planning differs from operational planning which tends to be single resource focused at a site-specific level (e.g., site plans, harvest plans, etc.).

**LRMPs:** Regional plans or LRMPs have been developed to address land use conflicts, environmental issues and competition amongst resource user groups. They have been used as a primary process for obtaining public sanction for new parks and protected areas. They are typically multi-agency initiatives coordinated by a designated planning agency, and involve stakeholders in an "interests-based negotiation" at a planning table. LRMP approval has been a Cabinet decision. Regional plans or LRMPs result in several main products including: broad land/coastal use zones delineated on a map; resource management objectives for land/coastal use zones; broad strategies for integrating resource use; socio-economic analysis; and plan monitoring, implementation and interpretation mechanisms.

**SRMPs:** These plans facilitate resource management decisions for small to medium size landscapes or watersheds. They focus on similar issues and values as regional plans or LRMPs (e.g. timber, biodiversity, tourism) but at a more detailed level. For example, SRMPs are used to identify Old Growth Management Areas (OGMAs), a priority component of biodiversity planning, for addressing specific economic development issues such as agriculture or tourism development, and are also useful for managing values such as spiritual and cultural resources as identified by FNs.

SRMPs are an important means of refining LRMP objectives so that they can be legally established under the *Forest and Range Practices Act* (FRPA). Some SRMPs deal with all resource values in a plan area, while others focus on only one or a few resource values and issues. There is also a uniquely identifiable subset of SRMPs that provide direction to public land and foreshore areas. These include coastal plans, Crown land development plans and

pre-tenure plans for oil and gas development. They are developed by the effective resource agencies in consultation with key stakeholders (usually in an advisory capacity), and are approved by the appropriate minister (currently the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands (MAL)).

## **2.2 Strategic Planning Evolution**

SLUP has evolved considerably since its inception in the early 1990s. Five distinct phases can be identified over the past 16 years, as follows:

**Phase I:** The Clayoquot Sound conflict era of the early 1990's and the subsequent Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE) land use plans for the majority of public land on Vancouver Island and then the Cariboo-Chilcotin and Kootenay-Boundary regions. At the same time the government of the day developed the *Forest Practices Code of British Columbia Act* (the Code), a part of which enabled a legal framework around plan implementation.

**Phase II:** The development and implementation of the first suite of LRMPs, beginning with Kispiox, Kamloops and Vanderhoof and ending with the completion of the northeast LRMPs (Fort St. John and Fort Nelson) and the establishment of the Northern Rocky Mountains Muskwa-Kechika Management Area (MKMA) in 1997-8. During this phase, the work required for "completion" of the Vancouver Island, Cariboo-Chilcotin and Kootenay-Boundary regions took place.

**Phase III:** Completion of most of the interior LRMPs in BC. Robson Valley, Prince George, Lakes, Bulkley Valley, Fort St. James, Cassiar-Iskut Stikine, Dawson Creek, Mackenzie, Okanagan, Kalum and, finally Lillooet by mid-2001. After the Spring 2001 election, a Cabinet decision approving the Lillooet LRMP was rescinded. Further, the Code was repealed and two new pieces of legislation and accompanying regulations identified to take its place: FRPA and the *Land Amendment Act*. A decision was made not to initiate any new LRMPs.

**Phase IV:** Continued development of the Central Coast, North Coast, Morice, Sea to Sky, Lillooet and Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte Islands (HG/QCI) LRMPs, with increased levels of engagement of FNs. Planning table recommendations from the Central Coast and North Coast were sent to government-to-government (G2G) discussions with affected FNs, and resulted in a "Coast Land Use Decision" involving both areas, and supported by specific FNs and government land use planning agreements.

**Phase V:** This current phase involves concluding G2G negotiations with FNs on the planning table recommendations for Morice, Sea to Sky, Lillooet and HG/QCI LRMPs. These negotiations are intended to develop mutually supported recommendations to Cabinet and FNs' leaders and are anticipated to be complete by the end of March 2007. It is assumed that there will be a 2 to 3 year completion phase required for the government decisions on these "legacy" LRMPs.

**SRMPs:** During LRMP Phase III, the province initiated planning at the landscape and watershed level (SRMPs). These were primarily focused within approved LRMP areas, with some exceptions. Most of this work involved identifying biodiversity conservation zones and

objectives (e.g., OGMAs, riparian areas, wildlife management areas) to aid FRPA implementation. In other cases, they were undertaken to address economic development issues for resources such as tourism and recreation or agriculture. SRMP level planning has continued through subsequent phases to fulfill this role. A marine/coastal foreshore allocation planning program took place during Phase IV.

### **2.3 Status of Strategic Land Use Planning**

In total, over 85% of the provincial Crown land base is now covered by 26 regional land use plans and LRMPs, including the 4 requiring final G2G negotiations. There are currently 102 SRMPs completed and a remaining 93 plans underway, for a total of 195.

Approximately 15% of BC remains without guidance or direction from a regional land use plan or LRMP, such as the Atlin-Taku, Nass and Merritt Timber Supply Area. Some of these areas are covered by SRMPs, including the Dease-Liard SRMP. Many coastal areas do not have marine/coastal Crown land use plans in place.

### **2.4 Benefits, Costs and Risk Assessment**

#### **Benefits**

Strategic planning outcomes do not easily lend themselves to a business case analysis that can demonstrate their social, economic and environmental benefits. However a number of recent studies<sup>1</sup> provide an indication of the types of benefits that have resulted from strategic planning:

- Improved communication, learning, understanding and inter-agency cooperation through stakeholder and agency participation.
- Increased involvement and benefits for FNs.
- Improved public understanding about the complexity of management of provincial resources.
- Building of trust and relationships and reduction of conflicts through participatory/collaborative approaches to planning.
- Cessation of the “war in the woods”, and more recent market campaigns.
- Improved direction for industry activities (e.g. forestry, mining, aquaculture, etc.).
- Increased lead time for decisions and improved clarity with respect to approvals.
- Improved resource inventories and mapping for better knowledge, cooperation, understanding and efficiencies in land and resource decisions and management.
- Establishing BC as a world leader in implementing the UN recommendations for protected areas to maintain biodiversity and protect special features.
- Identification of new policy and legislative tools to benefit threatened and endangered species, improve wildlife habitat and reduce impacts of industrial activity (e.g., Sensitive Areas).

---

<sup>1</sup> Frame (2002), Joseph (2004), Halseth and Booth (2003), Jackson and Curry (2004), Gryzbowski (2001), Pierce Lefebvre Socio-economic and Environmental Assessment Report (2001), ILMB Report on Land Use Planning in Northwest BC (2006) and the Belsey MLA Task Force Report (2003)

## **Costs**

The costs associated with strategic planning have varied substantially. The Belsey Report (2003) estimated that BC has invested about \$50 million in the past decade on SLUPs, though today, estimates are closer to \$100 million. This amounts to about \$6 million/year since 1990 or about \$3.5 million per regional plan (SRMPs are a more recent development). Internal research suggests that the cost to develop LRMPs has ranged from between \$1.4 million and \$3.9 million for LRMPs developed in the mid-1990s to between \$3 million and \$10 million (including work with FNs) for the more recent, large and complex plans (e.g., the North and Central Coast LRMPs). Internal research also shows that the cost to develop SRMPs in the last 3 years has ranged widely, from between \$37,000 and \$3.2 million per plan, the majority being several hundred thousand dollars. Note that these costs are best estimates by regions, are likely low and greatly influenced by how calculations are done.

The cost of implementing and monitoring LRMPs is estimated to range from between \$100,000 - \$800,000 per year, using the term "implementation" to mean activities that follow full completion of land use plans after a Cabinet decision has been made. Costs for SRMP implementation and monitoring are estimated to range between \$16,000 - \$180,000 per year. Costs have increased for recent plans, in part because government used to provide "in kind" key plan support through in-house staff (e.g. for timber supply analysis, GIS services, etc.) which have been eliminated and now often have to be paid through contracting.

The cost of engaging FNs in land use planning has also been examined. Approximately \$60,000 per FN per year has been spent in the recent LRMP processes. One-time contributions have also been made in some instances to individual FNs to develop their own land use plans as input to government planning. To date, there are few examples of FNs' engagement in post-completion implementation.

A comprehensive analysis of grants to FNs and FNs organizations completed for the three fiscal years shows most funding applied primarily to the completion of the Coast LRMPs and the other four outstanding plans in G2G. In addition, the Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB) of MAL, or its predecessor the Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management (MSRM) have contributed resources to FNs to aid in the implementation of existing plans (e.g., MKMA, Cariboo-Chilcotin) and for SRMP exercises (Dease-Liard, Valemount, 8 Peaks, etc.).

## **Risk Analysis**

The general and current approach to strategic planning was subjected to a risk analysis, specifically in relation to government's strategic values. The deliverable was a risk profile (a systematic and ranked list of risks) with associated mitigation strategies to inform the development of any new approach to strategic land use planning by government. The key principles/strategic values were:

- 1) Provide certainty to users of the land base, meaning that the process:
  - a) is transparent;
  - b) clearly identifies roles and responsibilities;
  - c) is timely;
  - d) results in an unambiguous outcome; and,

- e) applies consistent, defensible (scientific) standards.
- 2) Government retains its role as final decision maker, to ensure that its goals, objectives and value criteria inform the planning mandates.
- 3) Land use planning as an evolving process but occurring within the fiscal constraints of government.
- 4) Land is being used to its highest and best use which includes assisting government to make land allocations to support strategic priorities.
- 5) Key stakeholders have a role in the development and implementation of land use plans.
- 6) FNs' interests and values are incorporated into land use plans.

The risk assessment ranked risks in three principle areas: plan design; plan process; and planning technique. Proposed actions for mitigation of these three areas of risk are intended to inform a new planning framework, specifically with respect to introducing rigor and comprehensiveness of approach, business case analysis, and supporting standards, to introduce results-based procedures, and to research and implement innovative negotiating models.

## 2.5 ILMB Planning Resources

At this point in time, ILMB strategic planning resources (65 FTEs related to strategic planning) including 16 Forest Investment Account (FIA)/CLUPE funded) are allocated as follows:

- **22%** working on the 'big 6' legacy LRMPs of Central Coast, North Coast, Lillooet, Morice, Sea to Sky and HG/QCI.
- **22%** engaged in SRMP planning that directly achieves FRPA goals (e.g. OGMA and biodiversity planning).
- **15%** focusing their time on daily plan maintenance and monitoring.
- **15%** directly engaged on consulting with FNs.
- **8.5%** engaged in SRMP planning that achieves other goals (e.g. tourism vs. recreation).
- **6.5%** Program administration/support.
- **6%** working on plan amendment.
- **5%** engaged in Plan Implementation Committee (PIMC) activities.

## 2.6 Planning Rationale and Business Drivers

The rationale for continuing with a strategic planning program has varied over the past 16 years, but has consistently, and continues to include the following three reasons:

- Resolution of resource use conflicts.
- Resolution of potential competing uses through land allocation.
- Delivery of major government protection or conservation programs (e.g., Protected Areas Strategy, Grizzly Bear Management Strategy, Species-at-Risk).

In the past 3 years, however, a number of new business drivers have begun to emerge. These are:

- New Relationship commitments to engage FNs on a G2G basis in land use planning.

- Effects of major environmental changes such as climate change, and Mountain Pine Beetle infestations, and water shortages.
- Increasing global and North American energy and mineral demands and resultant increases in exploration and development activities on land, in streams and offshore.
- Coastal and marine planning and conservation initiatives by the federal government and FNs.
- New legislation and policies that enshrine some planning requirements (e.g., FRPA), or which supersede management directions approved in earlier regional plans and LRMPs.

### **3.0 DIRECTION:**

The following key questions have been addressed and a 'New Direction' for strategic land use planning formulated in response:

#### **1. Completed plans: Do we need to update and monitor them and if so, what structures, mechanisms and priorities should we use?**

##### **Direction**

- 1.1 Establish a strategic plan implementation monitoring committee (PIMC) for geographical regions or sub-regions of the Province, representing all the LRMPs and SRMPs completed in the geographical area. Include representation from key participants in the LRMP and SRMP processes, as well as FNs. Develop a standard terms of reference for the PIMCs, clearly outlining their role and responsibilities, membership, and level of support
- 1.2 Develop an action plan to migrate existing monitoring and implementation committees into these structures by March 31, 2007.
- 1.3 Restrict LRMPs and SRMP updating or amendment activities to specific components of a plan, as opposed to the entire plan. Require approval of updating or amendment requests by the inter-agency management committees (IAMCs). Develop standard procedures for FN engagement, and for consultation with the public and interested parties not represented on the PIMC.
- 1.4 Establish a list of priority circumstances that may warrant plan component updating or amendment. This list should include the need to align plan recommendations with policy and legislative changes, to reflect critical new information such as FNs' interests and values, and major environmental changes such as Mountain Pine Beetle infestation.
- 1.5 If a business case can be made for a comprehensive and thorough update of an LRMP to reflect new legislation, policy, information or environmental changes this should be done through the development of a specific plan or planning study for the topic or issue in question and forwarded to the ILMB Board of Directors for approval.
- 1.6 Support the updating or amendment of existing approved LRMPs and/or SRMPs affected by the Mountain Pine Beetle epidemic.



## **2. Legacy LRMPs: How do we expedite government decisions for the remaining LRMPs and complete the follow-up work required?**

### **Direction**

- 2.1 Conclude G2G discussions on all remaining legacy LRMPs (Morice, Sea to Sky, Lillooet and HG/QCI) by March 31, 2007 for Cabinet decisions and land use announcements.
- 2.2 Set a 3 year maximum time limit (end of fiscal 2009/2010) for completion of any follow-up work required for government decisions made for the Lillooet, Morice, HG/QCI, and Sea to Sky LRMPs, should completion work be necessary.
- 2.3 Require any further LRMP completion requirements (e.g., EBM, adaptive management, conservancy management, FNs interim measures, community support) to become the responsibility of the relevant ministry after the end of fiscal 2009/10, following which ILMB will restrict its level of support to planning and implementation monitoring functions.
- 2.4 Legacy LRMP plan implementation monitoring structures will be integrated into the sub-regional implementation structure recommended in Part 1 above.

## **3. FRPA planning requirements: How do we honour our current commitments to complete legislated FRPA planning while addressing new planning pressures?**

### **Direction**

- 3.1 Undertake an assessment of the extent of planning required for the successful implementation of the current FRPA planning model. Develop an action plan that includes a schedule and list of priorities that will allow the completion of SRMPs for OGMA objectives in support of FRPA purposes by December 31, 2007.
- 3.2 Complete biodiversity planning by the end of fiscal 2007/08.
- 3.3 Continue the FRPA planning that relates to establishing legal objectives.
- 3.4 Wherever possible, create efficiencies by building planning for FRPA values into plans done in partnership with FNs, the forest sector and other stakeholders.
- 3.5 Complete the development of legal objectives for EBM for application on the Central and North Coast and HG/QCI.

## **4. New strategic plans: Should we do new strategic plans and if so, what are the circumstances, priorities, processes and products?**

## Direction

- 4.1 Confirm the conclusion of the LRMP program and the initiation of new planning direction when announcing government land use decisions for the remaining legacy LRMPs.
- 4.2 Drop the LRMP and SRMP terminology and re-brand the strategic planning program (e.g., Strategic Land and Resource Plans).
- 4.3 Review strategic planning guidelines and procedure to ensure a focus on product requirements (e.g. FRPA, marine, land allocation) as opposed to hierarchical, geographical area-based plan requirements.
- 4.4 Initiate new strategic planning according to the following list of priorities and only in circumstances where:
  - Planning is required to give legal effect to products of strategic plans through FRPA, *Land Act* and other statutes.
  - Planning is required to address major emerging land use conflicts or competition among different user groups.
  - Planning is required to identify economic opportunities and constraints associated with public land and resources.
  - Planning is required to address FNs' opportunities, constraints, values and interests in areas where strategic plans have not been completed.
- 4.5 Require a "plan scoping" exercise be undertaken before formally proposing the initiation and funding of a new strategic plan.
- 4.6 Require ILMB Board of Directors' endorsement prior to initiation of any new strategic plan, and based on recommendations of the "plan scoping" exercise.
- 4.7 All new strategic planning processes should adhere to the following principles:
  - Led by government(s).
  - FNs' involvement on a G2G basis where interested.
  - Interest groups and stakeholders serve in a meaningful advisory capacity.
  - Clearly defined process, timelines and products.
- 4.8 Product or outcomes of strategic plans should be:
  - Clearly defined in a Terms of Reference.
  - Facilitate operational planning.
  - Minimize the need for supplementary "next-level" strategic planning.
  - Tailored to address the specific issues that led to the initiation of the plan.
- 4.9 New strategic planning design, process and techniques should be structured on recommendations of the risk assessment for strategic planning.

- 4.10 New plans should be undertaken only when the beneficiary or implementing agencies are prepared to support the costs of implementation.

## **5. First Nations: What framework and processes do we use to address the New Relationship commitments to strategic land use planning with FNs?**

### **Direction**

- 5.1 Develop a strategic planning Statement of Intent with the First Nations Leadership Council that provides overarching direction in accordance with key principles based on an assessment of existing, more detailed planning protocols.
- 5.2 Develop planning protocols with individual FNs, where appropriate, based on the principles in the Statement of Intent developed with the Leadership Council.
- 5.3 Ensure that planning processes are jointly developed, address capacity, decision-making and conflict resolution, and are mutually acceptable. Strive to reach formal agreement with individual FNs or where possible, aggregations of FNs at the plan level on both planning processes and products, recognizing that agreements differ in each case.
- 5.4 Focus FNs' involvement in new planning and plan updating or amendment processes on incorporation of FNs' values and interests, and on land and resource management issues and outcomes that provide direction for these values and interests.
- 5.5 Ensure plan updating activities generated by PIMCs are done in collaboration with FNs, where FNs have responded positively to requests for engagement. Plan updating will be led by government in collaboration with FNs and with advice from the appropriate implementation and monitoring committee.
- 5.6 Establish priorities for updating and amending existing plans based on:
- An assessment of risk to FNs' values and interests, with highest risk areas being addressed first.
  - Availability and cost of providing information on FNs' values and interests.
  - FNs' willingness to engage.
  - Available agency resources.
  - Level of IAMC support.
- 5.7 Pursue planning process outcomes with FNs that will reduce and streamline subsequent consultation requirements for specific developments. Planning outcomes must improve resource management and development certainty for investors, the province and FNs.
- 5.8 Support for FNs' requests for planning funds should be guided by the following:
- No support for the preparation of FN land use plans.

- Support for FN participation in joint provincial/FN planning where the planning exercise is a priority of government or has been committed to as part of a G2G agreement.
- Support for FN participation in joint provincial/FN planning that is not a priority of government or committed to as part of a G2G agreement only if the FN can confirm that it does not have access to the New Relationship fund or other funding sources.
- Support where new funding sources are specifically allocated by government as part of special programs or initiatives e.g., Mountain Pine Beetle Action Plan.

- 5.9 Continue with FRPA planning, but provide for broader engagement on strategic issues with affected FNs to support forest and range operations on public lands. On an interim basis, until FNs' values and interests are incorporated into existing plans, use FRPA and *Land Act* provisions to manage environmental values considered important to FNs. Amend and revise legal resource management objectives after FNs' values and interests are incorporated into these plans.
- 5.10 Consider a regionally-based process, similar to the regime now in place for the Coast, such as a traditional territory or grouped FN territories, where the province works collaboratively with FNs to confirm broad areas expressing level of opportunity vs. constraint, or confirm areas with different value levels that warrant variable management regimes relative to resource development activity. For each of the above areas, a different level of FN involvement in subsequent activity can be negotiated, ranging from conservancy management agreements to refined and coordinated referral processes.
- 5.11 Ensure planning processes and G2G planning tables do not become surrogate forums for negotiation of rights and title, interim measures and other treaty-related issues, and for negotiation over individual land transaction issues.

## **6. Funding and staffing: How do we allocate resources to meet the new planning direction and the associated government priorities?**

### **Direction**

- 6.1 Establish a 3 year maximum time limit for the end of ILMB's responsibility to fund completion work by other agencies and by FNs (e.g. protected areas, conservancy management and planning) associated with Cabinet land use plan decisions. After this period, funding for agency completion work should be advanced by the appropriate agency as part of its own budget submission.
- 6.2 Ensure that plan mandate and plan decision documents clearly identify the anticipated fiscal implications of proposed negotiating mandates and final land use plan recommendations to Cabinet on agency operational costs.
- 6.3 Ensure agencies are made aware of the need to incorporate anticipated additional operational costs resulting from Cabinet land use decisions into their individual budget

submissions to Treasury Board, particularly those costs that will be assumed from ILMB after the 3 year maximum time limit for ILMB funding of legacy plan completion work as noted in 6.1 above.

- 6.4 Establish a budget contingency to address unforeseen planning demands and unforeseen planning projects with FNs.
- 6.5 Continue ILMB's FRPA related planning and development of associated legal objectives only the basis of availability of FIA and CLUPE funding.
- 6.6 Maintain ILMB capability to represent the province in federal and local government planning processes where provincial interests and programs may be at risk, including maintenance of a marine and coastal planning program to support provincial involvement in federal oceans planning program, a marine protected areas initiative, and foreshore and marine resource allocation programs.
- 6.7 Assign resources to amend existing approved strategic plans affected by the Mountain Pine Beetle epidemic.
- 6.8 Provide sufficient resources for ongoing monitoring and amendment of OGMA/biodiversity plans.
- 6.9 Continue ILMB funding of implementation monitoring committees formed to provide oversight to ongoing plan implementation activities, as well as funding of new plans and plan revisions. Provide for a uniform level of funding for the operation of the new PIMCs and dedicate regional staff support to administer the PIMCs.
- 6.10 Provide sufficient resources to administer legal objectives and support ILMB/MAL's role in FRPA implementation – in ILMB regions and in Crown Land Administration Division of MAL, and ILMB, Victoria.
- 6.11 Support the re-establishment of strategic planning staff in resource agencies to provide capacity for direct participation in strategic plan development, and in implementation of land use plans and decisions.

#### **4.0 ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES:**

With the implementation of the New Direction, a different approach to strategic planning should become evident. The difference between the current approach and the New Direction is outlined in conceptual form in the table below.

## EXISTING SITUATION AND NEW PLANNING DIRECTION ANTICIPATED CHANGES

Characteristic	Before New Direction	After New Direction
<b>PIMCs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One committee per plan area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committees integrated into 1 per region/sub-region.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variable TOR, membership, funding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent TOR, functions, membership, funding.</li> </ul>
<b>Plan Updates or Amendments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entire plan revisited as determined by PIMC or schedule in approved plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update specific components only, and in accordance with established list of priority circumstances.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision to amend made by PIMC or staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IAMC approval required; Board of Directors for major revisions.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variable procedure for FN and public engagement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard procedures in place.</li> </ul>
<b>Legacy LRMPs (Morice, Sea-to-Sky, QCI, Lillooet, North Coast, Central Coast)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G2G not completed on 3 plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G2G outcomes concluded by March 31/07 for Cabinet decisions.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No real or perceived time limit on agency, FN follow-up activities to “complete” land use decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 yr maximum time limit for follow-up activities.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ILMB assumed responsible for wide range of plan completion activities (e.g. EBM, conservancies, community assistance).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After 2009/10 agencies become responsible for non-planning activities.</li> </ul>
<b>FRPA Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OGMA planning an ongoing priority which commands significant resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OGMA planning completed by December 31/07.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity planning an ongoing priority which commands significant resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity planning completed by end of 2007/08.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FRPA planning a follow up requirement to many strategic plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate FRPA requirements into planning processes wherever possible.</li> </ul>
<b>New Plans</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed reputation and outcome connotation for LRMPs and SRMPs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LRMP and SRMPs rebranded to SLRPs no new LRMPs.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current planning guidelines and procedures based on type of plan, not type of business need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Product or business-based strategic planning guidelines and procedures.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New plans done in response to a range of triggers or needs; have not confirmed a plan is necessary; are not always supported by agencies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New plans initiated only where they meet defined triggering criteria, have been subject to a scoping analysis, and approved by ILMB Board.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variable government leadership role; often dominated by non-government staff; not always done with FNs; often take too long; outcomes often provide no clear direction to resource managers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New plans are government led, done collaboratively with FNs, use stakeholders in advisory capacity, and have clear process, timelines and products.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes not always clearly defined in TOR; do not always facilitate operational planning, or minimize need for supplementary strategic planning; often go beyond dealing with the original</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes are clearly defined in TOR, facilitate operational planning, minimize need for supplementary strategic planning, and address the original issues.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>issues.</li> <li>Agencies often agree to plans but then expect ILMB to cover all subsequent implementation costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertaken only when beneficiary agencies are prepared to support the costs of implementation.</li> </ul>
<b>First Nations Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many variable planning agreements with different FNs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement of Intent with FN Leadership Council guides any specific planning agreements.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning processes often not done in collaboration with FNs; joint planning to date focuses on FN views of government's use designations and zones to restrict or allow activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jointly developed planning processes and outcomes with all affected FNs; involvement based on incorporating and providing direction on FN values and interests.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreement to update and amend plans based on individual FN requests and local circumstances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear priorities for updating and amending existing plans to address FN interests.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation requirements for post-plan development or management proposals unchanged by joint planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streamlining of after-plan consultation requirements.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No standard ILMB criteria for funding of FN planning requests; often provided to generate a competing FN plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear criteria for funding of FN planning support requests, based on priority placed by government on the plan or G2G arrangement.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some tables used or allowed to become forums for rights and title issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning tables focused on planning and not interim measures or treaty issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Funding and Staffing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent time limit on ILMB funding of plan completion of government's LRMP decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 year time limit for ILMB funding.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated completion and maintenance costs to agencies not articulated in plan mandate and decision documents; funded by ILMB.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated implementation and maintenance costs to agencies clearly articulated in plan mandate and decision documents and included in their own budget submissions.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ILMB must depend on other agency contingency funds for unforeseen planning costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget contingency for unforeseen planning demands and FN engagement in planning.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No capacity in ILMB to maintain involvement in federal or ENGO initiatives, especially marine planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity for marine planning program.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency strategic planning staff absorbed into former Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management, so agencies often unable to support ILMB planning efforts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases complement of strategic planning staff in resource agencies.</li> </ul>