Provincial Agricultural Land Commission Annual Report

for the year ended
31 March 1980

4333 Ledger Avenue
Burnaby, B.C.
V5G 3T3

The Honourable HENRY P. BELL-IRVING,
D.S.O., O.B.E., E.D.
Lieutenant Governor of the
Province of British Columbia

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR:

Herewith I beg respectfully to submit the Annual Report and Financial Statement of the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission for the year ended 31 March 1980.

James J. Hewitt
Minister of Agriculture

26 June 1980

The Honourable James J. Hewitt
Minister of Agriculture
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, B.C.

Dear Mr. Minister:

On behalf of the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission and pursuant to section 28 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act, Revised Statutes, 1979,* I respectfully submit the Annual Report and Financial Statement of the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission for the year ended 31 March 1980.

Yours very truly
M. F. CLARKE, *Chairman*

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

31 March 1980

CLARKE, Mills F., Nanaimo, B.C.—Chairman

—Former Director, Agriculture Canada Research Station, Agassiz, B.C., 1953–72

—Co-ordinator, Forage Crops Research, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, 1972–76

CLARIDGE, Allan. Oyama, B.C.—Member

—Orchardist

—Past President, B.C. Fruit Growers Association

—Chairman, Canadian Horticultural Council, 1970

CORNWALL, C.F. (Ted). Williams Lake, B.C.—Member

—Former District Agriculturist, B.C. Ministry of Agriculture

—Professional Agrologist and Member of the Appraisal Institute of Canada

FRAMST, C.E. (Ellie). Cecil Lake, B.C.—Member

—Retired farmer (grain and forage seeds)

—Peace River-Liard Regional District Board Member for 12 years, Chairman for 7 years

—Member of the Farm Credit Corporation Appeal Board

REDEL, Walter. Victoria, B.C.—Member

—Former Director of Lands

—Latterly, Assistant Deputy Minister in the B.C. Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing

ROGERS, John E. White Rock, B.C.—Member

—Former Manager of the White Rock Chamber of Commerce

ROGERS, Joseph, A. Penticton, B.C.—Member

—President and Director of Conagra Resources Management Co-operative, Kamloops, B.C.

—Former President of B.C. Livestock Producers Co-operative Association

—Member and Project Officer of B.C. Beef Industry Development Committee

STAFF, 31 MARCH 1980

MANAGEMENT

Gordon D. Gram — *Team Leader — Administration and Land Co-ordinator*

Jim P. Plotnikoff — *Team Leader — Technical Unit*

TECHNICAL UNIT—APPLICATION PROCESSING

Shirley Brightman	David Butler	Lenora Melville
Holger Burke	Bill Gilmore	Tracy Olsen
Hope V. Burns	Everett Lew	Jane Perch

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT AND ENFORCEMENT

Kirk Miller	Brian French

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND ALR REVIEWS

Sue Austen	J. Jay Simons

CONSULTANTS

Julie Glover	Terence Lewis	Joan Sawicki

CLERICAL UNIT

Lynda Congram	Kay Johnson	Trudy Reeves
Verona Hooson	Rose Langston	Jean Sherwood
Denise Jankovich	Patricia Redman	

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	7
Chairman's Comments	7
General Overview of the Commission's Responsibilities and Activities	8
Interactions with Local Governments and Authorities	9
Major Agricultural Land Reserve Reviews	10
Enforcement	11
Special Projects	11
Commission Farmlands	13
Speeches and Meetings	13
Financial Report—Schedule I Financial Statement	14
Statistics—Schedule II	14
Resume of types of Applications	15
Cumulative Statistics	17
Inclusion Statistics	19
9 (1) Statistics	21
9 (2) Statistics	24
9 (7) Statistics	27
9 (8) Statistics	29

INTRODUCTION

is is the seventh annual report of the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission. Each report is not simply to meet a statutory requirement, but as a reference point and an update of the s year's report. Cumulatively, the annual reports tell the story of the development and stration of British Columbia's farmland preservation program.

e need to protect farmland from further subdivision and non-farm development was recog- y British Columbians in the early 1970's. The limited amount of this Province's land base for ure and the implications of the annual loss of this land to urbanizing forces indicated that armland resource would have to be preserved if there was to be future food production on any e scale. When initiated, this legislation was unique, but is now complemented by a similar n in the Province of Quebec.

1978 the Minister of Agriculture for British Columbia set an objective for the 1980's of 65% elf-sufficiency. This production objective, together with provincial support pro- or the agriculture industry, tie into the agricultural land preservation program. Such programs n income assurance, enhanced ARDA projects and farmland taxation relief are examples of itive approach taken by government to encourage farmland utilization. The *Agricultural Land ission Act* is a prerequisite to the long-term success of such programs to enhance and develop Columbia's agricultural industry.

an's Comments

the latter part of the reporting year, the Commission underwent several changes. In Novem- 79, the Ministerial responsibility for the Agricultural Land Commission was transferred from ment to Agriculture. The Commission views this as a positive and appropriate move that, lly, will encourage closer liaison with the Minister of Agriculture and his staff. In particular, the ssion looks forward to more intensive utilization of the technical resources of the Ministry of ture. At the same time, the Commission continues to view its role as an independent udicial body, kept at arm's length from political pressures, and able to make independent ns based on the mandate established under the Act.

ere were a number of changes in the make-up of the Commission during this reporting year. nd Kerr resigned as Commissioner, effective 31 August 1979. G. Gary Runka, former an, resigned as Commissioner, effective 31 October 1979. Jim P. Plotnikoff, Senior Planner f, was appointed 1 November 1979 as Commissioner on an interim basis. In March 1980, a nent Chairman, Dr. M. F. Clarke, was appointed to relieve Axel Kinnear, who had been serving rim Chairman since January of 1979. Commissioners C. E. Framst, Joseph Rogers and Redel were also appointed at this time, Jim Plotnikoff then returning to his staff position. The y of experience among the seven Commissioners should be of benefit to the administration of icultural Land Reserves.

hough the workload is ever increasing, staff complement has remained at 22 persons. The ssion staff are a versatile group of individuals with diverse backgrounds. In the normal course mission work, they act as intermediaries between the Commission and applicants, local es and government officials.

of February, staff and Commission participate in an in-house educational session twice y. The purpose of these sessions is to discuss matters pertaining to agricultural land use, cation and planning. The Commission and staff benefit from this continued learning series, ncourages communication of ideas and concepts.

1977, an amendment was made to the application appeal process of the *Agricultural Land ission Act.* Under section 9 (8), applicants dissatisfied with the Commission's decision to exclusion of land from the Agricultural Land Reserve are now permitted to apply to the Minister e to appeal. The Commission is entitled to be a party at these appeal hearings before the ment and Land Use Committee and may take part in the proceedings. To this end, Commis- aff spent a large amount of time this year preparing background information on appeals for tation to the Environment and Land Use Committee.

It has been the Commission's policy to have one Commissioner and one staff person make representation at these hearings. The staff agrologist may also be present to explain technical information pertaining to soils and agricultural capability reports. The appellant may also be present and, on occasion, is represented by a lawyer, and perhaps an agrologist and other expert witnesses. Of the 38 requests for leave to appeal, 10 were granted by the Minister, 15 were refused and no decision has been made on the remaining requests. Of the 10 granted leave to appeal, 4 have since been heard by the Environment and Land Use Committee.

The 12-month reporting period from April 1979 to March 1980 saw the Commission more involved with legal matters, actively pursuing enforcement issues and attempting to cope with an unusual year of administration. The routine work of handling a large variety and increased volume of applications continued but, in addition, the appeal procedure itself attracted wide public attention.

As a result of appeal defence, enforcement problems and unusual individual application situations, the Commission has become increasingly involved with legal matters. The Homesite Severance policy, initiated by the Commission in June of 1978, also requires extensive legal work by both the Commission's solicitors and the applicant's legal representative.

Other costs, such as office expenses and advertising, have been kept to a minimum, although with additional Commissioners, fees and travel expenses have risen. The financial statements included with this report summarize administrative costs under the Ministry of Environment Vote for the entire year. For reasons of efficient bookkeeping, the Commission's Vote does not change to the Ministry of Agriculture until the beginning of the 1980/81 fiscal year.

General Overview of the Commission's Responsibilities and Activities

The Commission's authority to make decisions or recommendations on land use proposals that affect farmland is derived from the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* and the *Soil Conservation Act*. Over 3,000 applications are heard in a year, and each is individually researched by staff and reviewed by the Commission before a decision is made. Those applications that originate with the Commission and go forward to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for decision may involve substantial Agricultural Land Reserve review in an effort to "fine-tune" the boundary to better reflect agricultural capability and existing land use.

Applications made by regional districts or municipalities are to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but are first sent to the Agricultural Land Commission for review and recommendation. By far the greatest volume of applications continues to come from individuals, government agencies and Crown corporations and it is these that require a decision by the Commission. They include proposals for exclusion from the Agricultural Land Reserve, or subdivision and non-farm use within the Agricultural Land Reserve.

There is a routine processing procedure for all applications. Staff compiles relevant information, such as the Canada Land Inventory agricultural capability rating, land use and parcel size, as well as information on surrounding lands and previous applications. Every effort is made to render a resource based decision without reference to such factors as ownership.

Schedule II shows the number of new applications considered. Not included in this data are the number of new proposals received that are associated with old applications, nor the number of requests for reconsideration. The Commission gives fair and thorough consideration to all requests for reconsideration of decisions where substantial new information is received or a proposal significantly changed. Of course, further staff research and presentation time is required and it is estimated that 20 per cent of the Commission's work is now concerned with "old" rather than new applications.

The Commission also deals with many applications from other provincial agencies. The Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing is responsible for all Crown land in British Columbia. Crown land, if located in an Agricultural Land Reserve, is subject to the same provisions of the Act as privately owned land. Therefore, if a private individual or other government agency wishes to subdivide or use Crown land in an Agricultural Land Reserve for non-farm purposes, an application must be made through the Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing to the Commission.

1C. Hydro and Power Authority applications principally involve permission to construct Hydro ission-lines and transmitter sites. In recognition of the overall need for electrical power itting corridors, the Commission usually allows such applications but makes every effort to that the location will have minimum impact upon farmland. In certain instances, the Commis- ay alter the site location in the interest of protecting agricultural land.

umerous applications are also received from the various Ministry of Transportation and ays' district and regional offices. These applications are usually for the dedication of a right of r an existing road, the construction or upgrading of a road, or the establishment of a gravel e and/or pit. Commission approval of such applications is often subject to conditions that the agricultural lands and the affected farmers; for example, fencing, cattle guards and weed may be required. The Commission has also had the opportunity to review and comment upon ber of long range transportation network plans proposed by the Ministry's Planning Branch. ommission hopes to continue to have an early input into these network plans, as they are such ant indicators in the overall long range land use planning process which will affect the ltural Land Reserves.

ctions With Local Government Authorities

ne Commission maintains a close working relationship with local governments and provincial tory authorities. Before considering an application, the Commission looks to the municipality gional district for information on zoning and surrounding land use and for a recommendation merits of the application. Interaction with local governments is especially important when the ation is difficult to interpret or some vital information is missing.

ne planning staffs of the local or regional authorities usually complete the initial researching of plication. The Commission also relies on information supplied by the Technical Planning ittees and the Advisory Planning Commissions of the area. Technical Planning Committees ually composed of a representative from the Ministry of Agriculture, such as the District lturist; and representatives from other ministries such as Health; Lands, Parks and Housing; portation and Highways; Municipal Affairs; Fish and Wildlife; Environment (such as Water Branch) as well as members of municipal and regional staff. The members of the Advisory ng Commission are appointed by the board of the regional district or by a municipal council. ommission relies heavily on the network of expertise existing within the government ministries, ially at the local level, and may ask staff to contact any of the above representatives individually rmation relative to an application or to carry out an on-site of the property.

ne of the most important activities that has brought the Commission into more direct contact cal and regional governments is the increased momentum in the preparation of Official unity Plans and Settlement Plans in many areas of British Columbia. As an outgrowth of the dments made to the *Municipal Act* in 1977, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs has made grant s available to municipalities and regional districts for the preparation of Official Community and Settlement Plans.

essence, an Official Community Plan is a plan pertaining to an area of municipal jurisdiction Settlement Plan pertains to an "unorganized" area of a regional district. Both plans are tially development strategies for future community growth. The zoning bylaw that follows the on of the plan is the legal reflection of the objectives of the plan. As a resource document, these refer to such matters as population trends, economic basis of the community and existing es. They also provide an indication of anticipated land demand for at least a five-year period for such as residential, commercial and industrial. Before these plans are formally adopted and ementary bylaws set in place, a process of public hearings is required. Settlement Plans must e approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs.

lthough it may be intended that these plans be reviewed within a five-year period, it is obvious nce installed, the land use plan and accompanying bylaw will dictate land development policies considerable period of time. With this knowledge, the Commission has a special project team rised of several staff persons working with municipal councils and regional district boards in an

early review of these plans to encourage growth options outside of the Agricultural Land Reserves. The Commission also has a defined formal role in reviewing Settlement Plans for compatibility with the Agricultural Land Reserves before the plans are referred for Ministerial approval.

Basically the Commission's function is to review the overall concept of the plans submitted for consideration and, most importantly, to decide whether the plan designation proposed for lands within the Agricultural Land Reserve is appropriate. The Commission also peruses the objectives and policies contained in the plan document to ensure that these are consistent with provincial policy to protect farmland. Out of the process of preparing Community and Settlement Plans, there may come a review of the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary.

Although an exact count is not kept on the number of plans reviewed by the Commission, it is estimated that in this last fiscal year 50 or more such plans were commented upon.

Major Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) Reviews

It may be said that in considering each individual application, the Commission is constantly "fine-tuning" and reaffirming the ALR boundaries. However, in a more formal sense, "fine-tuning" refers to the process whereby the Commission carefully reviews the ALR boundary of a particular problem area and develops an application to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for addition to, and exclusions from, the Agricultural Land Reserve. The result is a more credible ALR boundary in terms of land capable of agricultural use and in terms of such factors as parcel size. Each year since the original ALR designations in 1974, the Commission has carried out a number of fine-tuning projects of varying sizes throughout the Province.

Three major Agricultural Land Reserve reviews were concluded within this reporting year. The Comox to Oyster River ALR review was forwarded to the Lieutenant Governor in Council in November 1978. The Commission had recognized, even at the time of designation, that the agricultural capability mapping that was available for much of Vancouver Island was at too small a scale to adequately reflect the complex landscape. The Regional District of Comox-Strathcona suggested the Comox to Oyster River review area and the Commission obtained more detailed agricultural capability information from the Resource Analysis Branch. During the re-examination of the ALR, the Commission received the full co-operation of the regional district and its staff. The study identified specific problem areas and proposed revisions to the ALR boundaries to better reflect the area's capability for agriculture. Cabinet, in making its decision in April 1979 to include 6,853 acres within the ALR and to exclude 8,636 acres, concurred with the Commission's recommendations.

A second ALR review conducted during this year was in the Cobble Hill area of the Regional District of Cowichan Valley. As part of the preparation of an Official Settlement Plan, and at the request of the regional district, the Commission obtained more detailed agricultural capability mapping from Soils Branch of the Ministry of Agriculture, for the south one-half of Electoral Area C. This information was forwarded to the regional district in early 1979, along with Commission guidelines on possible areas for the regional district to consider applying for exclusion from the ALR. The resulting application was forwarded to the Lieutenant Governor in Council in January 1980. In March 1980, Cabinet decided to exclude 408 acres from the Agricultural Land Reserve of the Regional District of Cowichan Valley.

In January of 1980, the Commission was also notified of a Cabinet decision on an application of long standing in the northwestern corner of British Columbia. In this case, Cabinet decided not to include in the ALR approximately 26,800 acres in the Regional District of Kitimat-Stikine and Stikine Region (unincorporated), known as the Stikine River Valley/Telegraph Creek Area. The inclusion application had first been submitted in December of 1976. The Commission's concerns were that there should be early delineation of those lands with agricultural capability, some as high as Class 2, and that they should be protected within an ALR in the face of growing pressures for settlement. By the time of Cabinet decision, the original application had been amended to incorporate a Land management Branch Planning Study that had mapped in considerable detail the agricultural capability of the region.

n extensive study of ALR boundaries, with an examination of parcel sizes and land uses, was arried out in the Township of Langley. Although a decision has not yet been made on the sed revisions to the ALR boundary, the review has attracted considerable public attention. With of Ministry of Agriculture staff, the Commission gathered information on potential and present se, parcel sizes, and evaluated agricultural capability information. This procedure involved l meetings with the municipal council and planning staff and numerous field visits by the ission. As a result, the Commission is forwarding an application to the Lieutenant Governor in il to rationalize the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary in this area of generally good ltural capability, but in very close proximity to an established and expanding urban area.

cement

n conjunction with local and regional authorities, the Commission administers the *Soil Con-tion Act*. Some problems have been encountered in carrying out this task because of a ance on the part of local authorities to fully assume the inspection and permit issuing responsi- of the statute. The Commission recognized this reluctance was somewhat justified, in the light fact that local authorities often do not have the manpower nor the expertise to effectually ister the legislation. To overcome this problem, the Commission has attempted to provide as technical expertise as possible, through appointment of a staff agrologist and by utilizing staff Soils Branch, Ministry of Agriculture, whenever practical.

nfortunately, even with this assistance, regulatory provisions of the *Soil Conservation Act* ding soil removal and fill deposition on lands in the Agricultural Land Reserve are not yet being istered uniformly across the Province. In a further effort, therefore, Commission staff are ring a possible revision to the Act that would transfer the day to day granting and administration *Conservation Act* permits to a regional level, such as the Ministry of Agriculture, where the cal expertise is available. In the event such changes are made to the Act and regulations, the ission foresees its future role as an appeal body for decisions made at a local or regional level.

ne number of applications for the second full year of administration of the *Soil Conservation Act* out 60. The majority of these applications have been from the Lower Mainland and Vancouver Generally, applications for soil removal or deposit of fill have been allowed, with rehabilitation ements to enhance or retain the agricultural capability of the land.

nfortunately, the Commission has had to deal with several infractions of both the *Agricultural Commission Act* and the *Soil Conservation Act* during this reporting year. Some of these ons have been as minor as the dumping of a couple of yards of fill on land within an Agricultural Reserve or as major as using Agricultural Land Reserve properties for large-scale industrial involving buildings, storage areas and air strips. The majority of infractions are handled lly by the Commission.

ne violator is advised of the requirements of the respective Act and, in most cases, is instructed the permission of the Commission by means of an application for the use. The application is onsidered on its individual merits.

owever, in certain cases, the violator does not respond to the orders of the Commission and mmission is forced to resort to legal recourse under sections 22 and 23 of the *Agricultural Land ission Act*. One such case this year confirmed the Commission's right to determine the type of ermitted on land in the Agricultural Land Reserve. The Court ruled in the Commission's favour e owner was given six months to terminate the non-farm activity on his property. This ent setting case will further enhance the Commission's power as a regulatory authority and, lly, will reduce the necessity to seek legal recourse for infractions occurring on land within the tural Land Reserve.

l Projects

e Commission is always interested in initiating and participating in special projects related to d preservation and support of the farming community. Also of continuing importance is the o inform the public, both urban and rural, of the vigilance needed to protect the limited

provincial land resource capable of producing food. During this year, the Commission took part in a number of special projects:

(a) In August 1979, the Commission, for the second year, had an information booth at the Pacific National Exhibition. Both Commissioners and staff attended the booth to answer numerous public inquiries. Featured at the booth was a new slide/tape show that explained the purpose of the Agricultural Land Commission and concept of the Agricultural Land Reserves. The slide/tape show proved to be an effective method of pictorally indicating how the Canada Land Inventory agricultural capability rating system of Class 1-7 is used to identify farmland. The Commission hopes to continue to utilize the slide/tape show as an educational tool to help explain the importance of farmland preservation.

(b) While not directly a special project of the Agricultural Land Commission, the Commission co-operated with Lands Directorate, Environment Canada, in conducting a study of the impact of the Agricultural Land Reserves in British Columbia. Lands Directorate of Environment Canada published Report 13 in their Land Use in Canada series, entitled *The Agricultural Land Reserves of B.C., An Impact Analysis*. The preface of the report indicates that the loss of prime agricultural land to urbanization and industrial growth has become a public issue throughout Canada. For this reason, British Columbia, being the first jurisdiction in Canada to take provincial action to protect agricultural land for present and future use, was of particular interest. Part of the conclusion reached by the study indicates that ". . . the reservation of agricultural land, as introduced in British Columbia, is a significant step towards ensuring that the province and the nation as a whole will have a high quality agricultural land resource to draw upon when that resource is required to feed future generations and to permit Canada to fulfil her international responsibilities."

(c) In September 1979, the Commission edited and published, for the B.C. Federation of Agriculture Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Subcommittee, *Farm and Stream: Water Use Farm Management and the Protection of the Aquatic Environment*. This report contains the results of an inquiry by the Committee into the nature of governmental constraints placed upon farmers attempting to manage water for the benefit of farm operations. It explains current legislative requirements and identifies conflict areas. Also included is an agency directory and various examples of application and approval forms. The major recommendation made by the Farm and Stream Committee were that there should be a set of procedures and an orderly system developed to deal with water management problems. In participating in this publication, the Commission hopes to encourage co-operation among all agencies in the hope of aiding the farm community in the development of the farmland resource, while at the same time, stimulating discussion of water management problems and concerns for the preservation of aquatic environments.

(d) During the year, there was an important breakthrough in taxation of land located within an Agricultural Land Reserve, an issue with which the Commission has been concerned for some years. Since 1976 and the McMath inquiry into property assessment and taxation, the Commission has encouraged government to amend assessment regulations to give some relief to owners of land within the Agricultural Land Reserve who do not have farm classification. The 1979 amendment to the *Public School Act* reduced by 50 per cent the assessment for school and hospital purposes of Agricultural Land Reserve lands and therefore, goes some distance in this direction.

(e) In May 1977, the Commission expressed to the Environment and Land Use Committee, concerns with proposed recreationally oriented development in the Columbia-Windermere area of East Kootenay Regional District and the resulting threat it posed to agricultural lands. In response to the Commission's concern, the Environment and Land Use Committee instructed its Secretariat to co-ordinate and overview investigation to identify suitable areas for accommodating recreational land development outside the Agricultural Land Reserve. The Commission participated in this investigation assisting the Secretariat in the collection of information on agricultural land use, including identification of ranch production units. Upon completion of the overview, the Environment and Land Use Committee

approved the preparation of a tourism settlement strategy and of a resource use strategy for the area. This work was undertaken by an inter-ministry government steering committee (Columbia-Windermere Lakes Steering Committee), of which the Commission is a member. The work leading to a tourism settlement strategy involved a major planning program conducted by consultants, including active public participation and local and regional government consultation. Phase I of the study, which focuses on general policies related to tourism settlement development, is now completed. One of the elements of the Phase I strategy is to guide tourism-settlement away from the land base employed for agriculture and other resource uses. Phase II proposals, presently under consideration by the Environment and Land Use Committee, include a program of action to maintain and enhance the resource use activities in the area, including agriculture.

(f) The Commission also continues to participate as an active member of the Green Zone Committee. The committee is continually working on the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) concept with local governments, in an attempt to incorporate the concept into local zoning bylaws. The Committee stresses co-operation with the B.C. Ministry of Agriculture and local governments in implementing a principle vital to farmland communities throughout the Province. To this end, it has now prepared model bylaws for beef, swine and poultry siting, odour control and encroachment protection that hopefully will be adopted by local authorities.

mission Farmlands

In 1976, the Commission amended the long-term farmland lease to include an option to hase for farmers who had satisfactorily completed three years of the 20-year lease term. Two erties were sold under this program in 1979/80: the 138-acre former Hayward property on the h Thompson River near Kamloops, and the 149-acre Thunderbird dairy property on New Lake ichan Road near Duncan. The Commission also sold a 15-acre knoll of the Steeples Ranch in East Kootenays to an adjacent landowner for horse pasture.

The major capital expenditure of the year was $82,000 for ditch clearing works at the Minnekhaproperty, west of the Pitt River in the District of Coquitlam. The clearing of the major drainage als and ditches was Phase I of a program to rehabilitate the Minnekhada farmlands. Phase II udes clearing and field drainage works by each of the four farm lessees.

eches and Meetings

With a part-time Chairman appointed on an interim basis for the majority of the year, and with the hands of frequent Commission meetings and travel for public hearings throughout the Province, e was little time for speeches by the Chairman or the Commission at the various annual ventions and conferences related to agriculture.

However, as Chairman, Mr. Kinnear did give two presentations: one in January 1980, at the B.C. t Growers Association Annual Convention and one in February 1980, at the B.C. Ministry of iculture Regional Staff Conference. The address to the Fruit Growers' Association covered eral aspects of the Agricultural Land Commission's work and addressed the major issues of the 0's that may affect the fruit industry and agriculture in general in British Columbia. The speech de to Ministry of Agriculture staff was on more specific matters, such as technical on-site reports tive to Agricultural Land Reserve applications, and urged Ministry field staff to become involved he local level in Community and Settlement Plan development.

As part of their regular workload, Commission staff had many meetings with planning staffs of ous municipalities and regional districts; local regulatory authorities, such as B.C. Hydro and istry of Highways; Soils Branch and Property Management Branch of the Ministry of Agriculture; the Resource Analysis Branch of the Ministry of Environment. Three staff persons also con-

ducted a Regional Seminar for Planning Assistants in Vernon in October 1979. The purpose of the seminar was to explain the procedures for processing applications submitted under the Act and regulations.

The Commission relies on such meetings to familiarize itself with the concerns of other authorities as well as to explain the program of preservation and protection of agricultural land.

Financial Report

The *Agricultural Land Commission Act* stipulates that the Commission submit annually to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, a financial statement exhibiting expenditures for the respective fiscal year. The statements of expenditures for the year ended 31 March 1980 follows as Schedule I.

SCHEDULE I

March 31, 1980

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES
for the Year Ended 31 March, 1980

	Capital Purposes	Administrative Purposes	Total
Professional and special services	63,470	48,139	111,610
Salaries	—	402,840	402,840
Program expenditures	45,845	—	45,845
Travel	—	73,513	73,513
Commission members fees	—	129,843	129,843
Office expense	—	37,472	37,472
Materials, supplies, utilities and taxes	3,381	1,629	5,010
Rentals	—	657	657
Advertising and publications	—	1,924	1,924
Grants	—	34,700	34,700
Totals	$112,697	$730,721	$843,419

(Prepared without Audit)

NOTES

During the year ended March 31, 1980, receipts from the sale of three Commission properties totalled $303,210, and revenue from properties owned or administered by the Commission, together with payments on improvements sold to lessees, amounted to $290,825. These amounts were paid to the consolidated revenue account of the Government of British Columbia.

Commission legal fees during the reporting period paid by the Ministry of the Attorney General totalled $76,377.

Approved on behalf of the Commission.

M. F. CLARKE, *Chairman.*
JOHN E. ROGERS, *Commissioner.*

Statistics

Schedule II includes Agricultural Land Reserve statistics to 31 March 1980. Attached to each individual application file is a statistical form that is completed at the time of each Commission decision. Tallying the results is a time-consuming job and there are, needless to say, deficiencies in a manual system, such as minor miscalculations or a decision improperly recorded. The procedure of retrieving decisions on the same or adjacent properties is also manual, which involves obtaining all the files in the vicinity of the subject property and individually summarizing them as to decision, acreage involved and other pertinent information.

The statistics that are collected are comprehensive, and now include information on the agricultural capability of land under application. The categories are based upon improved agricultural capability ratings and are grouped in four subclasses: Prime (totally Class 1 through 3 land); Prime Dominant Complex (major portion of the unit is prime land); Prime Subordinate Complex (lesser portion of unit is prime land); and Secondary (total unit is Class 4 or lower agricultural capability).

he cumulative statistics show that, at the time of designation, 11,661,000 acres were in the iltural Land Reserve; as of 31 March 1980, 11,623,623 acres are in the Agricultural Land ve. These statistics, however, do not indicate the agricultural capability of the land and, ore, conclusions should not be based on the acreage numbers alone, as the quality of the land; s, the agricultural capability rating, has only recently been included in the statistical data. rally speaking, those lands that have been excluded from the Agricultural Land Reserve tend to her high capability land in relatively small parcels, or low capability land that was originally ed in the Agricultural Land Reserve through error. The total amount of land removed is a result rge number of individual applications submitted under the appropriate sections of the Act. On her hand, lands included in the Agricultural Land Reserve after designation tend to be of rate capability, or sometimes grazing land, and are the result of only a few large acreage cations.

Now that agricultural capability information is being recorded as a routine matter for each cation, statistical analysis of the Agricultural Land Reserve can incorporate not only acreages, so indicate quality of land being included into, or excluded from, or a subdivision/use within the ultural Land Reserves. Further statistical information may be obtained from the Agricultural Commission office in Burnaby.

SCHEDULE II

I. Brief Resume of Types of Applications Under the Agricultural Land Commission Act

Chapter 46, 1973 including Land Commission Act 1977
(Consolidated for convenience only, Jan. 20, 1978)

on 9 (1) (a) and (b) applications—Direct government to government applications for exclusion or exemption se or subdivision within an Agricultural Land Reserve.

Under section 9 (1) (a), the Agricultural Land Commission, a regional district, or a municipality may make cation to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for exclusion of private or Crown lands from an Agricultural Reserve, or the Lieutenant Governor in Council may initiate such action on his own.

Under section 9 (1) (b), the Agricultural Land Commission, a regional district, or a municipality may make cation to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for subdivision and/or non-farm use of private or Crown lands n an Agricultural Land Reserve.

Prior to the submission of an application under section 9 (1) (a) or (b), the municipality, regional district, or Commission, as the case may be, must hold a public hearing on the application. A report of the hearing must *mpany the application. As a part of the standard operating procedure the Commission reviews the* cation and formulates a recommendation which is subsequently reviewed by the Environment and Land Committee. Final decision is made by Cabinet as a Cabinet Order in Council.

ion 9 (2) applications—Applications from an individual to the Agricultural Land Commission for exclusion.

Under this section an individual land owner may apply to the Agricultural Land Commission for exclusion of roperty from an Agricultural Land Reserve. Preliminary processing of these applications is done by the opriate regional district, followed by further processing and a hearing by the Commission. The final decision ese applications is made by the Commission, without reference to the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the onment and Land Use Committee. However, there is an appeal procedure under sections 9 (7) and 9 (8).

ion 9 (7) appeals—Appeals by an individual to the Environment and Land Use Committee on Agricultural Commission decisions.

Under this section a person who is dissatisfied with a decision of the Commission under section 9 (2) of the nay file a notice of appeal to the Environment and Land Use Committee *only if* he has obtained a Certificate ave to appeal, signed by any two members of the Agricultural Land Commission.

This appeal requires a formal hearing and the final decision is made by the Environment and Land Use mittee.

ion 9 (8)

Under this section a person who is refused leave to appeal by the Commission may, within 30 days of being ed, apply to the Minister for Leave to Appeal to the Environment and Land Use Committee. If the leave to al is granted a formal hearing is held and the final decision is made by the Environment and Land Use mittee.

Section 11 (4) applications—Applications for exemption for use or subdivision within an Agricultural Land Reserve.

Under this section a person or agency may apply to the Agricultural Land Commission for permission to subdivide land or to use a parcel of land within an Agricultural Land Reserve for purposes other than those allowed outright by the Act or regulations. The land remains in the Agricultural Land Reserve and the Commission may impose whatever terms and conditions it considers advisable. The decision of the Commission is final. There is no appeal, except to the courts on a question of law or excess of jurisdiction. The applicant may however, request the municipality or regional district, as the case may be, to submit an application under section 9 (1) (b) on his behalf.

Sections 8 (12) and 8 (14)—Applications for inclusion into the Agricultural Land Reserve.

Section 8 (12)—A municipality, a regional district, or the Commission may apply to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to have additional lands designated as an Agricultural Land Reserve, whether or not they own those lands. The municipality, regional district, or commission, as the case may be, must hold a public hearing in respect to the application and must give proper notification to the property owners. A report of the public hearing must accompany the application. The commission reviews the application and formulates a recommendation which is subsequently reviewed by the Environment and Land Use Committee on behalf of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Cabinet makes the final decision by Order in Council, and if approved, the Agricultural Land Commission designates the lands as, or part of an Agricultural Land Reserve.

Section 8 (14)—An individual owner may apply to the Agricultural Land Commission, via the regional district to have his land included in an Agricultural Land Reserve. No hearing is required and the Commission may designate the land as Agricultural Land Reserve, after approval from the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Applications pursuant to the subdivision and land use regulations.

Under the subdivision and land use regulations, certain kinds of very limited subdivision and land use may be allowed by local government without reference to the Commission. In addition, another category of subdivision and certain conditional uses may be applied for directly to the Commission. When application for the conditional use is received by the Commission, the Commission consults with the regional district or municipality so that they might present their views prior to the decision being made by the Commission.

Direct orders or resolutions of the Commission.

It is possible for the Agricultural Land Commission to deal directly, by a specific order or resolution, with certain other situations requiring land use or subdivision approval without the necessity for a formal application. Very infrequent use is made of this power as it pertains only to unusual circumstances involving extreme emergency or hardships and in those cases where the necessity for a formal application is questionable. In all cases the Commission attempts to contact the local government to determine its position on the matter.

April 1, 1980

RES INCLUDED AND EXCLUDED FROM THE AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE BY YEAR
(Cumulative Figures)

e of Application	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1st Quarter 1980	Total
ons	*Nil*	14,981	1,277	10,621	47,278	8,031	186	82,374
ions:								
1)	526	4,392	3,399	40,207	20,985	17,941	6,973	94,423
2)	937	2,941	2,304	6,154	4,729	5,375	1,487	23,927
7)	*Nil*	405	121	493	21	129	*Nil*	1,169
8)	*Nil*	*Nil*	*Nil*	*Nil*	163	669	*Nil*	832
creage cluded	1,463	7,738	5,824	46,854	25,898	24,114	8,460	120,351

Total ALR acreage at designation	11,661,600
Total acreage included since designation	82,374
Total acreage excluded under 9 (1)	94,423
Total acreage excluded under 9 (2)	23,927
Total acreage excluded under 9 (7)	1,169
Total acreage excluded under 9 (8)	832
Current ALR acreage as of April 1, 1980	11,623,623

SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS CONSIDERED UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION ACT
(All Figures are Cumulative)

9 (2) SUMMARY
(Applications by an owner to exclude land from ALR)

Number of applications*	2,020
Acres requested for exclusion	88,791
Land Commission decision:	
Remain in ALR	38,640
Exclude	23,927
Allow 11 (4)	26,224

9 (1) SUMMARY
(Applications by Municipality, Regional District, or the Commission to exclude land from ALR)

Number of applications*	107
Acres requested for exclusion	120,842
Land Commission recommendation:	
Allow	93,040
Refuse	27,802
Cabinet decision	
Allow	94,423
Refuse	26,419

INCLUSION SUMMARY
(Application to include land into ALR)

Number of applications*	78
Acres requested for inclusion	120,026
Land Commission recommendation:	
Allow	109,181
Refuse	37,886
Cabinet decision:	
Allow	82,374
Refuse	34,164

* The number of applications refer only to those that have been processed, i.e., those applications that are instream have not been considered in this summary.

April 1, 1980

CURRENT ALR ACREAGE BY REGIONAL DISTRICT

Regional District	Approximate Acreage at Date of Designation	Inclusions	Acreage Excluded				Approximate Acreage as of April 1, 1980
			9 (1)	9 (2)	9 (7)	9 (8)	
-Clayoquot	19,600	—	—	98	—	—	19,502
-Nechako	735,100	—	192	439	—	—	734,469
	48,400	90	966	1,190	—	—	46,334
)	2,286,000	10,656	29,318	2,874	—	—	2,264,464
Coast	11,000	—	—	69	—	—	10,931
Fraser Valley	136,700	—	1,734	862	36	643	133,425
Kootenay	176,700	800	9,007	735	—	—	167,758
Okanagan	81,700	226	247	1,122	—	—	80,557
ia-Shuswap	166,500	413	14,669	1,757	424	—	150,063
-Strathcona	108,000	8,825	12,458	1,984	—	—	102,383
an Valley	54,300	5	949	857	—	4	52,495
ey-Alouette	58,700	1,186	6,785	207	—	26	52,868
otenay	673,100	—	308	3,282	—	83	669,427
Cheam	90,800	2	686	273	137	—	89,706
Fort George	863,600	53,456	230	967	—	—	915,859
Vancouver	80,400	3	394	310	11	—	79,688
Stikine	158,500	5,120	298	272	—	—	163,050
ay Boundary	136,000	—	85	247	394	—	135,274
Waddington	4,300	—	—	—	—	—	4,300
o	52,000	359	27	670	136	—	51,526
kanagan	173,600	25	372	899	10	—	172,344
an-Similkameen	213,600	258	180	924	11	—	212,743
River-Liard	3,702,500	35	—	1,587	—	—	3,700,948
River	34,900	—	8,116	56	—	—	26,728
-Queen Charlotte	108,400	—	—	337	—	—	108,063
sh-Lillooet	67,000	—	415	179	—	—	66,406
e Coast	15,500	—	4,494	290	10	—	10,706
son-Nicola	1,404,700	915	2,493	1,440	—	76	1,401,606
Totals	11,661,600	82,374	94,423	23,927	1,169	832	11,623,623

April 1, 1980

ACREAGE INCLUDED IN ALR SINCE DESIGNATION BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR

Regional District	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	Total
	30	37	15	—	8	—	90
)	—	—	9,920	—	736	—	10,656
Kootenay	—	—	—	800	—	—	800
Okanagan	—	4	65	—	—	157	226
ia-Shuswap	30	—	—	47	324	12	413
Strathcona	—	1,060	468	444	6,853	—	8,825
an Valley	—	5	—	—	—	—	5
ey-Alouette	42	—	—	1,144	—	—	1,186
Cheam	—	—	2	—	—	—	2
Fort George	8,816	—	—	44,640	—	—	53,456
Vancouver	—	—	3	—	—	—	3
Stikine	5,120	—	—	—	—	—	5,120
o	51	123	148	20	—	17	359
kanagan	—	25	—	—	—	—	25
an-Similkameen	—	—	—	183	75	—	258
River-Liard	—	—	—	—	35	—	35
son-Nicola	892	23	—	—	—	—	915
Totals	14,981	1,277	10,621	47,278	8,031	186	82,374

1979 and First Quarter 1980 Figures (up to April 1, 198

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS INCLUDED IN THE ALR
(By Order in Council)

Regional District	Total Area Included (Acres)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondar
Capital	8	—	—	8	—
Cariboo	736	—	660	—	76
Central Okanagan	157	69	—	—	88
Columbia-Shuswap	336	214	—	12	110
Comox-Strathcona	6,853	395	6,458	—	—
Nanaimo	17	15	—	1	1
Okanagan-Similkameen	75	75	—	—	—
Peace River-Liard	35	—	—	—	35
Totals	8,217	768	7,118	21	310

1979 and First Quarter 1980 Figures (up to April 1, 198

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS REFUSED FOR INCLUSION
(By Cabinet Decision)

Regional District	Total Area (Acres)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondar
Capital	16	16	—	—	—
Fraser-Fort George	10	3	—	—	7
Kitimat-Stikine	26,800	—	—	26,800	—
Totals	26,826	19	—	26,800	7

April 1, 1980

INCLUSION SUMMARY SHEET BY REGIONAL DISTRICT (Cumulative Figures)

Regional District	Number of Applications In Which Decisions Have Been Made	Acreage Requested for Inclusion	Acreage Recommended for Inclusion by the Agricultural Land Commission	Acreage Approved for Inclusion by Cabinet
-Nechako	6	7,100	—	—
	7	113	90	90
	3	10,656	10,656	10,656
Coast	1	50	—	—
Kootenay	2	800	800	800
Okanagan	4	226	226	226
ıbia-Shuswap	6	600	413	413
-Strathcona	6	8,903	8,825	8,825
ıan Valley	1	5	5	5
ey-Alouette	6	1,264	1,186	1,186
-Cheam	1	2	2	2
-Fort George	8	56,306	53,456	53,456
r Vancouver	2	8	3	3
-Stikine	2	31,920	31,920	5,120
no	14	875	359	359
Okanagan	1	25	25	25
gan-Similkameen	4	223	265	258
River-Liard	1	35	35	35
son-Nicola	3	915	915	915
Totals	78	120,026	109,181	82,374

April 1, 1980

ACREAGE EXCLUDED BY CABINET UNDER 9 (1) APPLICATION BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR

Regional District	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	Total
y-Nechako	—	10	110	72	—	—	—	192
al	—	800	—	103	63	—	—	966
o	—	197	—	22,771	—	6,350	—	29,318
al Fraser Valley	357	—	252	750	153	222	—	1,734
al Kootenay	—	36	100	—	8,780	—	91	9,007
al Okanagan	—	—	—	—	247	—	—	247
bia-Shuswap	—	511	382	583	4,508	2,354	6,331	14,669
x-Strathcona	—	—	1,460	1,894	468	8,636	—	12,458
han Valley	—	186	—	380	—	—	383	949
ney-Alouette	150	60	3	—	6,572	—	—	6,785
Kootenay	—	—	—	140	—	—	168	308
r-Cheam	—	—	16	670	—	—	—	686
r-Fort George	—	—	—	—	—	230	—	230
er Vancouver	—	—	365	—	20	9	—	394
t-Stikine	—	—	298	—	—	—	—	298
nay Boundary	—	85	—	—	—	—	—	85
mo	—	—	—	—	27	—	—	27
Okanagan	4	165	4	199	—	—	—	372
agan-Similkameen	15	—	25	—	—	140	—	180
l River	—	—	—	8,116	—	—	—	8,116
mish-Lillooet	—	31	384	—	—	—	—	415
ine Coast	—	—	—	4,494	—	—	—	4,494
pson-Nicola	—	2,311	—	35	147	—	—	2,493
Totals	526	4,392	3,399	40,207	20,985	17,941	6,973	94,423

1979 and First Quarter 1980 Figures (up to April 1980)

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS EXCLUDED BY APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 9 (a)
(By Order in Council)

Regional District	Total Area Excluded (Acres)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
Cariboo	6,350	—	100	—	250
Central Fraser Valley	222	5	—	—	217
Central Kootenay	91	7	60	—	24
Columbia-Shuswap	8,685	127	—	110	448
Comox-Strathcona	8,636	14	—	3,161	461
Cowichan Valley	383	40	—	165	78
East Kootenay	168	17	—	—	51
Fraser-Fort George	230	25	—	—	205
Greater Vancouver	9	5	—	—	4
Okanagan-Similkameen	140	—	—	—	140
Totals	24,914	240	160	3,436	2178

1979 and First Quarter 1980 Figures (up to April 1980)

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS REFUSED FOR EXCLUSION BY APPLICATIONS UNDER 9 (1) (a)
(By Cabinet Decision)

Regional District	Total Area (Acres)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
Central Fraser Valley	85	48	—	—	37
Central Kootenay	3,876	3,100	—	—	776
Central Okanagan	3,711	205	—	—	3,506
Cowichan Valley	25	25	—	—	-
Greater Vancouver	25	25	—	—	-
North Okanagan	109	60	49	—	-
Okanagan-Similkameen	1,320	309	25	—	986
Totals	9,151	3,772	74	—	5,305

April 1, 1980

9 (1) (a) SUMMARY SHEET BY REGIONAL DISTRICT (Cumulative Figures)

Regional District	Number of Applications	Acreage Requested for Exclusion	Acreage Requested for Exclusion by Land Commission	Acreage Approved for Exclusion by Cabinet
Bulkley-Nechako	4	1,976	192	192
Capital	5	1,438	903	966
Cariboo	6	30,307	29,318	29,318
Central Fraser Valley	11	3,316	1,984	1,734
Central Kootenay	6	12,905	9,007	9,007
Central Okanagan	3	640	255	247
Columbia-Shuswap	17	18,766	14,659	14,669
Comox-Strathcona	8	12,474	12,458	12,458
Cowichan Valley	5	2,538	949	949
Delta-Alouette	6	8,174	6,445	6,785
East Kootenay	3	768	168	308
Fraser-Cheam	4	2,800	686	686
Fraser-Fort George	1	230	230	230
Greater Vancouver	6	896	64	394
Kitimat-Stikine	1	770	298	298
Kootenay Boundary	1	130	85	85
Nanaimo	2	38	27	27
North Okanagan	6	1,483	372	372
Okanagan-Similkameen	3	1,500	180	180
Powell River	1	8,116	8,116	8,116
Squamish-Lillooet	2	613	115	415
Sunshine Coast	2	4,494	4,494	4,494
Thompson-Nicola	4	6,470	2,035	2,493
Totals	107	120,842	93,040	94,423

1979 and First Quarter 1980 Figures (up to April 1, 1980)

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS GIVEN APPROVAL FOR SUBDIVISION AND/OR USE BY APPLICATIONS UNDER 9 (1) (b)
(By Order in Council)

Regional District	Total Area (Acres)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
Greater Vancouver	43	43	—	—	—
Total	43	43	—	—	—

1979 and First Quarter 1980 Figures (up to April 1, 1980)

RICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS REFUSED FOR SUBDIVISION AND/OR USE BY APPLICATIONS UNDER 9 (1) (b) (By Cabinet Decision)

Regional District	Total Area (Acres)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
Greater Vancouver	8	8	—	—	—
Kootenay Boundary	5	—	—	5	—
Peace River-Liard	3	3	—	—	—
Totals	16	11	—	5	—

April 1, 1980

9 (1) (b) SUMMARY BY REGIONAL DISTRICT (Cumulative Figures)

Regional District	Number of Applications	Acreage Requested for Subdivision or Use Within the ALR	Acreage Requested for Subdivision or Use Within the ALR by Commission	Acreage Requested for Subdivision or Use Within the ALR by Cabinet
Greater Vancouver	3	181	—	43
Kootenay Boundary	1	5	—	5
Okanagan-Similkameen	1	10	—	—
Peace River-Liard	1	3	—	—
Powell River	2	41	—	—
Totals	8	240	—	48

April 1, 1980

ACREAGE EXCLUDED BY COMMISSION RESOLUTION UNDER 9 (2) APPLICATION BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR

Regional District	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	Total
Alberni-Clayquot	—	—	—	—	98	—	—	98
Bulkley-Nechako	—	52	—	133	169	65	20	439
Capital	11	340	70	248	108	385	28	1,190
Cariboo	—	167	108	199	204	1,981	215	2,874
Central Coast	—	—	50	5	9	—	5	69
Central Fraser Valley	78	134	3	383	61	202	1	862
Central Kootenay	6	31	55	248	302	90	3	735
Central Okanagan	—	280	58	196	315	85	188	1,122
Columbia-Shuswap	40	489	347	425	223	212	21	1,757
Comox-Strathcona	271	295	457	707	203	11	40	1,984
Cowichan Valley	96	172	143	138	114	194	—	857
Dewdney-Alouette	22	12	27	—	80	50	16	207
East Kootenay	—	235	155	1,980	630	282	—	3,282
Fraser-Cheam	—	9	13	50	91	34	76	273
Fraser-Fort George	—	—	—	116	603	168	80	967
Greater Vancouver	61	29	7	160	13	30	10	310
Kitimat-Stikine	—	78	—	—	144	5	45	272
Kootenay Boundary	—	18	29	—	88	112	—	247
Nanaimo	—	171	61	200	182	52	4	670
North Okanagan	87	245	30	84	374	79	—	899
Okanagan-Similkameen	175	34	32	322	259	102	—	924
Peace River-Liard	—	—	—	59	229	1,181	118	1,587
Powell River	—	48	4	4	—	—	—	56
Skeena-Queen Charlotte	—	—	52	—	—	—	285	337
Squamish-Lillooet	—	5	119	15	5	35	—	179
Sunshine Coast	90	19	—	78	93	10	—	290
Thompson-Nicola	—	78	484	404	132	10	332	1,440
Totals	937	2,941	2,304	6,154	4,729	5,375	1,487	23,927

* Entries based on actual date of decision *not* on date of application (all figures approximate).

1979 and First Quarter 1980 Figures (up to April 1, 1980)

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS EXCLUDED BY APPLICATIONS UNDER 9 (2)

Regional District	Total Area Excluded (Acres)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
ey-Nechako	85	—	—	65	20
al	413	215	20	—	178
po	2,196	—	10	56	2,130
al Coast	5	5	—	—	—
al Fraser Valley	203	1	—	—	202
al Kootenay	93	16	12	—	65
al Okanagan	273	52	171	—	50
nbia-Shuswap	233	15	30	56	132
x-Strathcona	51	5	6	7	33
chan Valley	194	14	6	—	174
lney-Alouette	66	—	—	—	66
Kootenay	282	7	—	30	245
r-Cheam	110	62	—	—	48
r-Fort George	248	—	—	—	248
er Vancouver	40	5	—	—	35
at-Stikine	50	—	—	45	5
nay-Boundary	112	—	—	—	112
imo	56	8	1	—	47
Okanagan	79	69	—	—	10
agan-Similkameen	102	7	49	1	45
e River-Liard	1,299	1,010	70	60	159
na-Queen Charlotte	285	—	100	100	85
mish-Lillooet	35	35	—	—	—
hine Coast	10	—	—	—	10
pson-Nicola	342	53	—	—	289
Totals	6,862	1,579	475	420	4,388

April 1, 1980

9 (2) SUMMARY SHEET (Cumulative Figures)

Regional District	Number of Applications (Decisions Made)	Number of Acres Requested for Exclusion	Regional District Recommendations (Acres)				Commission Decisions (Acres)		
			Remain in ALR	Exclude	Allow 11 (4)	No Comment	Remain in ALR	Exclude	Allow 11 (4)
Alberni-Clayoquot	11	356	22	113	8	213	168	98	90
Bulkley-Nechako	42	3,975	2,044	1,721	41	169	2,511	439	1,025
Capital	119	3,737	2,164	772	20	781	1,827	1,190	720
Cariboo	103	7,998	1,417	4,763	251	1,567	3,228	2,874	1,896
Central Coast	8	232	22	174	36	—	9	69	154
Central Fraser Valley	127	4,311	2,175	1,869	253	14	2,631	862	818
Central Kootenay	104	2,156	—	—	—	2,156	575	735	846
Central Okanagan	165	4,363	1,220	2,705	190	248	2,382	1,122	859
Columbia-Shuswap	177	5,070	1,638	2,741	523	168	1,791	1,757	1,522
Comox-Strathcona	143	5,898	1,587	3,065	134	1,112	1,738	1,984	2,176
Cowichan Valley	174	3,639	1,303	1,627	347	362	1,595	857	1,187
Dewdney-Alouette	33	1,359	447	440	20	452	981	207	171
East Kootenay	113	14,588	48	1,506	16	13,018	6,316	3,282	4,990
Fraser-Cheam	46	1,090	64	537	106	383	483	273	334
Fraser-Fort George	30	3,479	944	1,028	913	594	1,276	967	1,236
Greater Vancouver	47	1,425	1,281	139	—	5	1,092	310	23
Kitimat-Stikine	13	665	190	379	—	96	43	272	350
Kootenay Boundary	21	757	141	580	19	17	461	247	49
Nanaimo	118	3,715	1,060	1,654	135	866	2,089	670	956
North Okanagan	104	3,453	394	1,625	908	526	504	899	2,050
Okanagan-Similkameen	120	3,888	272	3,114	108	394	1,080	924	1,884
Peace River-Liard	58	4,956	1,829	2,180	20	927	2,682	1,587	687
Powell River	9	137	35	97	5	—	75	56	6
Skeena-Queen Charlotte	4	495	158	337	—	—	73	337	85
Squamish-Lillooet	21	746	54	674	18	—	206	179	361
Sunshine Coast	27	1,043	439	28	—	576	628	290	125
Thompson-Nicola	83	5,260	100	833	102	4,225	2,196	1,440	1,624
Totals*	2,020	88,791	21,048	34,701	4,173	28,869	38,640	23,927	26,224

* All figures are approximate.

April 1, 1980

NUMBER OF REQUESTS FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL TO THE COMMISSION PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 (7) OF THE ACT BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR

Regional District	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	Total
·ni-Clayquot	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	2
·y-Nechako	—	—	—	—	3	4	1	8
al	—	—	—	—	1	4	—	5
oo	—	—	—	—	1	3	1	5
al Fraser Valley	—	2	1	3	3	2	2	13
al Kootenay	—	1	—	—	2	—	1	4
al Okanagan	—	3	2	3	3	5	—	16
nbia-Shuswap	—	—	—	1	—	2	1	4
x-Strathcona	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	4
chan Valley	—	1	2	2	4	3	1	13
ney-Alouette	—	—	2	—	1	1	—	4
Kootenay	—	—	—	—	7	8	—	15
r-Cheam	—	—	1	—	—	4	1	6
r-Fort George	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
er Vancouver	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	3
nay Boundary	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
imo	—	—	3	3	5	5	—	16
Okanagan	—	—	1	—	1	1	2	5
agan-Similkameen	2	1	—	—	1	2	—	6
e River-Liard	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
mish-Lillooet	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
nine Coast	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	3
ipson-Nicola	—	—	—	—	2	3	1	6
Totals	2	9	14	14	39	52	12	142

April 1, 1980

9 (7) CERTIFICATE OF LEAVE SUMMARY SHEET
(Enviornment and Land Use Committee shown as E.L.U.C.)

Regional District	Number Requested	Commission			E.L.U.C.		Acreage Excluded
		Allow	Refuse	Other	Allow	Refuse	
Alberni-Clayoquot	2	—	1	1	—	—	—
Bulkley-Nechako	8	1	5	1	1	—	—
Capital	5	—	5	—	—	—	—
Cariboo	5	1	4	—	1	—	—
Central Fraser Valley	13	1	11	1	1	—	36
Central Kootenay	4	—	1	2	—	—	—
Central Okanagan	16	3	13	—	—	1	—
Columbia-Shuswap	4	1	2	1	1	—	424
Comox-Strathcona	4	—	4	—	—	—	—
Cowichan Valley	13	—	13	—	—	—	—
Dewdney-Alouette	4	—	4	—	—	—	—
East Kootenay	15	—	14	1	—	—	—
Fraser-Cheam	6	2	4	—	2	—	137
Fraser-Fort George	1	—	—	1	—	—	—
Greater Vancouver	3	1	2	—	1	—	11
Kootenay Boundary	1	1	—	—	1	—	394
Nanaimo	16	4	10	2	3	1	136
North Okanagan	5	1	4	—	1	—	10
Okanagan-Similkameen	6	1	5	—	1	—	11
Peace River-Liard	1	—	—	1	—	—	—
Squamish-Lillooet	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
Sunshine Coast	3	1	2	—	1	—	10
Thompson-Nicola	6	—	6	—	—	—	—
Totals	142	18	111	11	14	2	1,169

April 1, 1980

ACREAGE EXCLUDED BY THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE AS A 9 (7) APPEAL BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR

Regional District	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	Total
Central Fraser Valley	—	—	36	—	—	36
Columbia-Shuswap	—	—	424	—	—	424
Fraser-Cheam	—	—	8	—	129	137
Greater Vancouver	—	—	—	11	—	11
Kootenay-Boundary	394	—	—	—	—	394
Nanaimo	—	111	25	—	—	136
North Okanagan	—	—	—	10	—	10
Okanagan-Similkameen	11	—	—	—	—	11
Sunshine Coast	—	10	—	—	—	10
Totals	405	121	493	21	129	1,169

April 1, 1980

NUMBER OF REQUESTS FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL TO THE MINISTER PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 (8) OF THE ACT BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR

Regional District	1978	1979	1980	Total
Clayoquot	1	—	—	1
Nechako	1	2	1	4
	2	2	1	5
	—	2	1	3
Fraser Valley	—	3	2	5
Okanagan	1	3	—	4
an Valley	1	2	1	4
ey-Alouette	1	—	—	1
otenay	2	5	1	8
Cheam	—	2	—	2
Vancouver	—	2	—	2
o	3	3	1	7
Okanagan	—	—	3	3
an-Similkameen	—	1	—	1
sh-Lillooet	—	1	—	1
e Coast	1	—	—	1
son-Nicola	1	2	2	5
Totals	14	30	13	57

April 1, 1980

9 (8) CERTIFICATE OF LEAVE SUMMARY SHEET
(Environment and Land Use Committee shown as E.L.U.C.)

Regional District	Number Requested	Minister			E.L.U.C.		Acreage Excluded
		Allow	Refuse	Other	Allow	Refuse	
Clayoquot	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
Nechako	4	2	1	1	1	—	—
	5	2	2	1	—	2	—
	3	1	1	1	—	—	—
Fraser Valley	5	2	2	1	1	1	643
Okanagan	4	2	2	—	—	1	—
ia-Shuswap	1	—	—	1	—	—	—
Strathcona	1	—	—	1	—	—	—
an Valley	4	3	1	—	2	—	4
ey-Alouette	1	1	—	—	1	—	26
otenay	8	3	1	4	1	1	83
Cheam	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vancouver	2	2	—	—	—	1	—
o	7	1	5	1	—	1	—
kanagan	3	—	—	3	—	—	—
an-Similkameen	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
sh-Lillooet	1	1	—	—	—	—	—
e Coast	1	1	—	—	—	1	—
son-Nicola	5	3	—	2	1	—	76
Totals	57	24	17	16	7	8	832

ACREAGE EXCLUDED BY THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE AS A 9 (8) APPEAL BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR

Regional District	1978	1979	Total
Central Fraser Valley	—	643	643
Cowichan Valley	4	—	4
Dewdney-Alouette	—	26	26
East Kootenay	83	—	83
Thompson-Nicola	76	—	76
Totals	163	669	832

Queen's Printer for British Columbia ©
Victoria, 1980