Provincial Agricultural Land Commission Annual Report

for the year ended
31 March 1981

4940 Canada Way
Burnaby, B.C.
V5H 4K6

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 March 31, 1981.

James J. Hewitt
Minister of Agriculture and Food

29 September 1981

The Honourable James J. Hewitt
Minister of Agriculture and Food
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 1X4

Dear Mr. Minister:

Pursuant to section 28 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*, I respectfully submit the Annual Report and Financial Statement of the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission for the year ended March 31, 1981.

Yours very truly,
PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION
M. F. Clarke, *Chairman*

CONTENTS

PAGE

AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION MEMBERS 5

AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION STAFF 6

PROLOGUE 7

CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS 8

OVERVIEW OF YEAR'S ACTIVITIES

- Regionalization 10
- Change in Regulations Under the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* 11
- Block Applications for Inclusion/Exclusion 12
- Enhanced Agricultural Land Commission Fine Tuning Program 14
- *Soil Conservation Act* 15
- Commission Owned Farmlands 15
- Financial Report 17
  - Schedule I to Financial Statement 18
  - Schedule II to Financial Statement 18
- Statistics 19
  - Schedule III 19

British Columbia Cataloguing in Publication Data

British Columbia. Provincial Agricultural Land Commission.
Annual report. -- 1978-

Report year ends March 31.
Continues: British Columbia. Provincial Land Commission. Annual report. ISSN 0703-2374
ISSN 0708-4048 = Annual report - Provincial Agricultural Land Commission

1. British Columbia. Provincial Agricultural Land Commission. 2. Land use, Rural - British Columbia. 3. Agricultural conservation - British Columbia.

HD319.B7B764 354.7110082'326

AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION ON 31 MARCH 1981

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

—*Former Director, Agriculture Canada Research Station, Agassiz, B.C., 1953–1972*

—*Co-ordinator, Forage Crops Research, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, 1972–1976*

John E. Rogers, White Rock, B.C.—Vice-Chairman

—*Law Clerk*

—*Former Manager, White Rock Chamber of Commerce*

C. E. (Elli) Framst, Cecil Lake, B.C.

—*Retired farmer (grain and forage seeds)*

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

—*Member, Farm Credit Corporation Appeal Board*

Robert P. Murdoch, Burnaby, B.C.

—*Former Manager, University Endowment Lands*

—*Former Regional Director, Minister of Lands, Parks and Housing*

Ian D. Paton, Delta, B.C.

—*President, Paton & Smith Farm Services, Ltd., Langley*

—*Past President, B.C. Institute of Agrologists, 1979-80*

Joseph A. Rogers, Penticton, B.C.

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

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

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

Arthur R. Sutcliffe, Creston, B.C.

—*Active farmer (grains, seeds, vegetables)*

—*Central Kootenay Regional District Director, Former Chairman (15 years association); Creston Dyking District, Chairman/Board Trustee*

—*President, Kootenay Dehydrators (alfalfa)*

STAFF, 31 MARCH 1981

Robert P. Murdoch
General Manager

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT DIVISION

Jean Sherwood, Executive Secretary

Denise Jankovich	Rose Langston	Trudy Reeves
Kay Johnson	Patricia Redman	Dina Smith

PLANNING, PROCESSING AND TECHNICAL DIVISION

James P. Plotnikoff, Director

PLANNING STAFF

Sue Austen	Julie Glover, Consultant	Jay Simons

PROCESSING STAFF

Kabel Atwall	Shirley Brightman	Martin Hilmer
Jim Bell	Holger Burke	Everett Lew
	Hope V. Burns	

TECHNICAL STAFF

Steve Leach, Supervisor

Verona Hoosen	Brian Underhill

PROPERTY AND SOILS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Gordon D. Gram, Director

SOILS STAFF

Brian French, Consultant	Kirk Miller	Edmond Pottinger
Terence Lewis, Consultant		Joan Sawicki, Consultant

FINE TUNING STAFF

Mark Gillis	Vaclav Kalina	Wilf Tonsmann

PROLOGUE

For the benefit of readers not familiar with the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*, the ollowing is a brief resume of the types of applications which may be made.

Section 11 (1) and (2) applications—Direct government to government applications for exclusion or exemption for use or subdivision within an Agricultural Land Reserve:

Under Section 11 (1), the Agricultural Land Commission, a regional district, or a municipality may make applications to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for exclusion of private or Crown lands from an Agricultural Land Reserve, or the Lieutenant Governor in Council may nitiate such action on his own.

Under Section 11 (2), the Agricultural Land Commission, a regional district, or a municipality may make application to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for subdivision and/or non-arm use of private or Crown lands within an Agricultural Land Reserve.

Prior to the submission of an application under Section 11 (1) or 11 (2), the municipality, egional district, or the Commission, as the case may be, must hold a public hearing on the application. A report of the hearing must accompany the application. As a part of the standard operating procedure the Commission reviews the application and formulates a recommendation which is subsequently reviewed by the Environment and Land Use Committee. Final decision is made by Cabinet as a Cabinet Order in Council.

Section 12 (1) 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 his property from an Agricultural Land Reserve. Preliminary processing of hese applications is done by the appropriate regional district, followed by further processing nd a hearing by the Commission. The final decision on these applications is made by the Commission, without reference to the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the Environment and .and Use Committee. However, there is an appeal procedure under Sections 13 (1) and 13 (2).

Section 13 (1) appeals—Appeals by an individual to the Environment and Land Use Committee n Agricultural Land Commission decisions:

Under this Section a person who is dissatisfied with a decision of the Commission under Section 12 (1) of the Act may file a notice of appeal to the Environment and Land Use Committee nly if he has obtained a Certificate of Leave to Appeal, signed by any two members of the gricultural Land Commission.

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

Section 13 (2)—Under this Section a person who is refused leave to appeal by the Commission may, within 30 days of being refused, apply to the Minister for Leave to Appeal to he Environment and Land Use Committee. If the leave to appeal is granted a formal hearing is eld and the final decision is made by the Environment and Land Use Committee.

Section 20 (1) applications—Applications for exemption for use or subdivision within an gricultural Land Reserve:

Under this Section a person or agency may apply to the Agricultural Land Commission for ermission to subdivide land or to use a parcel of land within an Agricultural Land Reserve for urposes other than those allowed outright by the Act or regulations. The land remains in the gricultural Land Reserve and the Commission may impose whatever terms and conditions it onsiders advisable. The decision of the Commission is final. There is no appeal, except to the ourts on a question of law or excess of jurisdiction. The applicant may however, request the unicipality or regional district, as the case may be, to submit an application under Section 1 (2) on his behalf.

Sections 10 (3) and 10 (5)—Applications for inclusion into the Agricultural Land Reserve:

Section 10 (3)—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 10 (5)—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.

CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

This report summarizes the principal activities of the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission during its eighth year of operation. Each annual report of the Commission serves as a reference point by which the people of this Province can evaluate the work of the Commission; cumulatively these annual reports chronicle the development and general progress of the farmland preservation program.

The 1980-81 fiscal year has been a very busy and challenging one for the Commission and its staff. Applications to the Commission for exclusion and subdivision, utility corridors and highway rights of way, have increased very substantially. This situation is a reflection in part of a very active and often highly speculative real estate market. The Province has obviously been experiencing an accelerating inflow of population and of capital. It is obvious therefore that continually increasing demands for land for urban uses creates a heavy workload for regional districts and municipalities as well as for the Agricultural Land Commission. Regional districts throughout the Province have been making substantial progress in the formulation and updating of Official Community Plans and Settlement Plans, thanks in no small measure to the provisions of grant money from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. To this end, the Agricultural Land Commission has worked closely with the planning staffs and Planning Commissions of regional

districts in order to maintain the integrity of the agricultural lands within the boundaries of local jurisdictions. During this past year the Commission has given a high priority to achieving active dialogue with regional district boards and elected municipal officials with a view to achieving in concert with local decision makers, a more rational approach to land use through forward planning. In this exercise the Commission acknowledges that other segments of society have requirements for land in order to accommodate industry, residences, services and recreation. The objective is to meet such needs while protecting our precious and limited store of higher capability agricultural land.

More active participation in the land use planning process will, hopefully, resolve many of the difficulties associated with what has come to be known as "fine tuning" of the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). However, to further expedite the more accurate definition of ALR boundaries, the Commission was given special budgetary funds in the 1980-81 fiscal year to defray the cost of field work and mapping in areas where soils information was inadequate or inaccurate at the time the Agricultural Land Reserve maps were drawn. This program is expected to require five to six years for completion.

While a great deal can be accomplished by sound planning, we, in all walks of life, must come to accept the fact that land is a fixed resource that must be shared among an ever increasing population of users. Nowhere is this more evident than in British Columbia where a series of rather confined mountain valleys must accommodate our needs for food production, housing, secondary industry, service corridors and recreation. It is inevitable therefore that our society must come to accept increased density of human settlement in urban areas. This in effect will entail a sharp reduction in availability of rural homesites on acreage residential lots contiguous to urban centres.

Although problems of conflict between urban and agricultural activities have been evident for some time, it is disturbing to note that reports of such problems are increasing very sharply. In situations where urban developments are adjacent to active farms, incidents of vandalism, harrassment of livestock and theft are very numerous. In more densely-populated areas of the Province the Commission as well as municipal authorities are required to deal with a two-way impact situation. Aside from the problems of farmers as listed, the occupants of contiguous urban developments complain bitterly of unpleasant odours from livestock operations and of possible pollution by agricultural chemicals used in pest control procedures on crops. In such instances it is only fair to state that those seeking to enjoy the benefits of rural living cannot realistically expect to enjoy all of the amenities of urban living without encountering some of the less than aesthetic phenomena that occasionally arise in connection with active farming operations.

It should be pointed out however, that gradual progress is being made toward overcoming impact problems associated with the farm/residental interface. Gains are being made primarily through close collaboration with regional districts and municipalities in land use planning. The Commission staff have been working closely with Ministry of Agriculture and Food personnel on what is known as the Green Zone Committee. The objective in this work is to develop adequate specifications for the siting of buildings for intensive beef, swine and poultry operations. To this end, the Committee has prepared model bylaws for these types of livestock operations, incorporating specifications for siting, odour control and protection from encroachment. Some local authorities have adopted these and hopefully similar bylaws will be developed for all affected areas.

During the year covered by this report, there have been some changes in the membership of the Commission. In October of 1980, Mr. Allan Claridge of Oyama and Mr. Ted Cornwall of Williams Lake, retired from the Commission after four years of distinguished service. It is of particular interest that these gentlemen were the first Commissioners to have served the full four-year term specified in the *Agricultural Land Commission Act.* In December, Mr. Arthur

Sutcliffe of Creston and Mr. Ian Paton of Delta were welcome additions to the Commission. In July, Mr. Robert Murdoch joined the Commission in the capacity of general manager, responsible for all operational activities. In addition to his managerial role, Mr. Murdoch also holds an appointment as a Commissioner and participates in this role on occasions where other Commissioners are unavailable thus maintaining the Commission at full working strength at all times. In March of 1981 Commissioner John Rogers of White Rock, presently the longest serving Commissioner, was designated as Vice-Chairman within the statutory provisions of the Act.

A special word of acknowledgement is extended to the staff of the Commission. In a very active and often difficult year, the staff have given dedicated service well beyond what might be considered as normal requirements of the work. Likewise, a special word of tribute is extended to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food for their generous assistance in many aspects of the work. The resources of the Commission are limited in many areas and therefore the assistance of Ministry specialists has been of inestimable value. Much more will be said of such activities in the body of the report. It will also be evident that many other ministries of government are involved in the work of the Commission in various ways. Their co-operation and assistance is also gratefully acknowledged.

The Provincial Agricultural Land Commission values very highly the assistance it receives from farm organizations throughout the Province.

Aside from considerations of our food supply options, it should be recognized that agriculture in British Columbia is a viable, dynamic industry in its own right. In employment terms alone the agriculture/food system provides at least one job in five. Furthermore, a dollar at the farm gate has a spin-off effect to the economy in the order of nine to ten times as compared to a factor of seven for most other industries.

OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR'S ACTIVITIES

Regionalization

For the purpose of processing the applications, the Province has been divided into six regions. The following shows the Regional District breakdown:

Region 1—Vancouver Island

Regional Districts: Comox-Strathcona, Alberni-Clayoquot, Nanaimo, Cowichan Valley, Capital, Sunshine Coast, Islands Trust.

Region 2—Lower Mainland

Regional Districts: Greater Vancouver, Central Fraser Valley, Dewdney-Alouette, Fraser-Cheam.

Region 3—Kootenay and Coastal

Regional Districts: East Kootenay, Central Kootenay, Kootenay Boundary, Powell River, Squamish-Lillooet, Mount Waddington.

Region 4—Okanagan

Regional Districts: Okanagan-Similkameen, Central Okanagan, North Okanagan.

Region 5—Interior

Regional Districts: Columbia-Shuswap, Thompson-Nicola, Cariboo.

Region 6—North

Regional Districts: Central Coast, Skeena-Queen Charlotte, Kitimat-Stikine, Bulkley-Nechako, Fraser Fort-George, Peace River-Liard.

This regionalization has allowed the Agricultural Land Commission staff to become familiar with their specific region and to develop contacts with the staffs of the regional districts within their region. It has also resulted in a better flow of applications to the Commission.

The continuing support of the regional district in the processing of applications is greatfully acknowledged.

Changes in Regulations Under the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*

In 1977, the Agricultural Land Commission recognized that the existing subdivision and land use regulations (B.C. Regulation 93/75) required revision to reflect the current policy of the Commission. Some of the proposals for change were fairly significant and required detailed discussions with various ministries of the Provincial Government, regional districts and municipalities, and the general public at large. Finally in late 1980, a consensus was reached and new regulations were enacted in January 1981.

By way of brief explanation, at the request of the Ministry of the Attorney General, former B.C. Regulation 93/75 was split into two separate regulations. One regulation (B.C. Regulation 8/81), commonly called the Agricultural Land Commission subdivision and land use regulation, lists those categories of subdivision and land use that are permitted without any approval from the Commission. These subdivisions and many of the uses were generally termed "outright uses" in the former regulation. In addition, those uses termed "conditional uses" in the former regulation have been added (as B.C. Regulation 8/81) to existing B.C. Regulation 313/78 which is the Commission's procedural regulation. Essentially this addition specifies those uses and subdivisions which are dealt with as "special cases" meaning simply that while they still require an approval of the Commission, the method of obtaining the approval is direct from the Commission and is less complicated and time consuming than are regular applications under either Section 12 (1) or 20 (1) of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*.

The substantive changes to the regulations are as follows:

(1) The former regulation specified that additional dwelling units as necessary for farm use were allowed as outright uses. This section was deleted since the statute itself permits any type of additional dwelling that may be required for farm use.

(2) Public parks, recreation reserves and wildlife reserves were formerly listed as outright uses. In the new regulation, only those parks, recreation reserves and wildlife reserves that are not intensive in nature are left as an outright use while those that involve substantial alterations to the land become a conditional use or "special case" which would require an approval from the Commission. Essentially, parks and recreational reserves that involve development of less than 1 000 square metres, where the park is less than 2 hectares, or less than 4 000 square metres, where the park is greater than 2 hectares, would not require an approval from the Commission.

(3) Golf courses, which were an outright use, have now become a conditional use or "special case" which requires approval from the Commission. This change, and the change noted in point 2 above, reflect an increasing concern of the Commission over the establishment of such uses in the Reserve. While parks, recreational reserves, wildlife reserves and golf courses may not irreversibly alter the land so as to permanently destroy its agricultural potential, the Commission is concerned that their inappropriate location within the Agricultural Land Reserve can create very serious impact problems for legitimate farming operations in the vicinity. Parks and golf courses have a very strong people orientation which very often creates some severe problems for the surrounding agricultural community. Similarly, wildlife winter ranges and waterfowl nesting areas, while not people oriented, can pose very difficult problems for farmers as a result of the impact of the wildlife. Rather than allowing these uses to establish

anywhere in the Agricultural Land Reserve, the Commission now considers them on a case-by-case basis.

(4) The former regulation listed any additional dwellings that may be required for non-farm use for joint tenants or tenants-in-common as a conditional use. This has now been deleted and these uses will be coming forward as regular applications under Section 20, subsection 1 of the Act.

(5) Schools and other public institutions were listed in the former regulation as a conditional use. These have now been deleted and will be coming forward as regular applications under the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* thus having the benefit of full public exposure and scrutiny by local government rather than coming directly to the Commission with little exposure at the local level.

(6) Horse-riding arenas or boarding stables and dog kennels have been added as conditional uses or special cases under the revised regulations since they are quasi-agricultural in nature. By establishing them as special cases, the Commission can consider each situation on a case-by-case basis thus insuring that they are not located in areas where they would create difficulties for the surrounding agricultural community.

There were some additional minor changes in wording but these did not affect the substance of the Regulations.

Summary of Major Block Applications Submitted Under Sections 11 (1) and 10 (3) of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* Completed During the 1980-81 Fiscal Year

1. Seymour Arm (Regional District of Columbia-Shuswap)

The review of the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary surrounding this recreational community in Shuswap Lake resulted in inclusion of lands into the Agricultural Land Reserve as well as exclusions from the Reserve.

This study of the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary resulted from an application submitted by the Regional District. Two key pieces of information served as a basis for the review. First, new soil/agricultural capability mapping for the study area provided the basis for soil analysis in this area. Second, land use information in the form of parcel size data and land demand information was provided by the Regional District. This second source of information was compiled in response to Settlement Plan preparation.

The net result of this application is a refined Agricultural Land Reserve boundary which reflects both improved soil/agricultural capability information as well as local land use needs documented through a Settlement Planning exercise.

2. Tête Jaune Valemount (Regional District of Fraser-Fort George)

The Tête Jaune Valemount application centred on a study area located between Tête Jaune Valemount and McNaughton Lake in the Regional District of Fraser-Fort George. This was also a joint application submitted to the Lieutenant Governor in Council by both the Agricultural Land Commission and the Regional District of Fraser-Fort George. Inclusion of land into the Agricultural Land Reserve as well as exclusion of land resulted from this application.

The agricultural capability ratings for the soils in this area were reviewed by the Soils Branch, Ministry of Agriculture and Food following field work in the area. The revised soil/agricultural capability ratings indicated some higher capability soils for agriculture in the study area than were previously identified in the Canada Land Inventory.

The Regional District had been preparing a Settlement Plan for the Valemount Tête Jaune area concurrently with the review of the Agricultural Land Reserve boundaries. In fact, the Settlement Plan and the subject application pursuant to the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* went to public hearing on the same date. However, it should be noted that most of the resulting

amendments to the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary were based on agricultural capability considerations and not present land use or parcel size information. The Settlement Planning process in itself revealed that ample land exists outside the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary for rural/residential development in the foreseeable future. Consequently, while local planning considerations were reviewed during the Commission's examination of the application, revised soil information provided the basis for the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary amendment decision-making process.

3. Langley Review (Central Fraser Valley Regional District)

The review of the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary in the Township of Langley was finalized in the 1980-81 fiscal year. While the application for exclusion of lands was submitted independently by the Agricultural Land Commission, the review was conducted in full consultation with the Corporation of the Township of Langley.

The Property Management Branch, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, played an integral role in the assembly of data for this review. Factors for which data was compiled included revised soil/agricultural capability ratings, existing land use status, existing agricultural activity, parcel size, and proximity of agricultural activities to other farm related operations.

The result of the review and subsequent application to the Lieutenant Governor in Council was a refined Agricultural Land Reserve boundary through the exclusion of several hundred hectares of land. However, also important was the fact that through the data compiled by the Property Management Branch, there developed a much greater understanding of the importance of the Township of Langley as an agricultural industry support centre.

4. Robson Valley (Regional District of Fraser-Fort George)

This particular review centred on the Robson Valley from Swiftwater to Mount Robson Provincial Park. The result of the review was a joint application from both the Agricultural Land Commission and the Regional District of Fraser-Fort George to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for amendment to the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary.

The area under review is largely undeveloped, the majority consisting of Crown land with a portion of the review area falling within Mount Robson Provincial Park. Consequently, information pertaining to land use planning did not have a prominent role in this particular Agricultural Land Reserve boundary review.

The review itself was based primarily on technical information pertaining to soil capability in the valley bottom. The intent of the review was to "fine tune" the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary through the exclusion of lands with low agricultural capability, largely consisting of steep slopes and gravel benches.

5. Cobble Hill (Cowichan Valley Regional District)

While this application resulted in only a minor amendment to the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary, it is a good example of where land use planning information had a dominant role in the formulation of the Commission's recommendation to Cabinet.

The application was initiated individually by the Regional District of Cowichan Valley. The request for exclusion of lands came about following the preparation of an Official Settlement Plan in the Cobble Hill area. Information pertaining to parcel size, residential lot supply and demand in the Plan area, servicing infrastructure and land use planning strategy in this particular situation was central in the Commission's review and formulation of recommendations on the application. The planning exercise revealed that land use demands within the settlement area, without alternatives outside the Agricultural Land Reserve, justified the application for exclusion of lands from the Agricultural Land Reserve.

6. Powell River Review (Powell River Regional District)

The Powell River review examined the Agricultural Land Reserve lands to the immediate east of the District Municipality of Powell River and west of Lang Creek. The review was conducted by the Commission in close consultation with the Regional District of Powell River.

The basis of the review was revised soil/agricultural capability rating information provided by the Terrestrial Studies Branch, Ministry of Environment. Other information considered by the Commission during the review included consultation with the Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing on land status information through the preparation of a Crown Land Master Plan as well as contact with the Ministry of Forests on Provincial Forest Boundary review in the study area.

As is the case in all block applications to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, a public hearing was held. Information gathered from the hearing as well as submissions which followed were considered by the Commission. Minor amendments to the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary amendment proposal were made following the receipt of public input.

The result of the review and application is an Agricultural Land Reserve boundary which has received input from the public, two levels of government and several Provincial Government ministries. The process may be seen as a review with input from diverse interest agencies, culminating in a refined definition of the legislative boundary of protection for the agricultural land resource.

Enhanced Fine Tuning Program

In the early days of the program, 1973-74, it was well-known that the definition of the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary as being a fair representation of where the line should be drawn to protect land with potential for agricultural use varied from area to area in the Province. Furthermore, it was known that land use decision making is a dynamic process whether we are talking of privately owned lands or Crown land and the Agricultural Land Reserve boundaries could not be "etched in stone" at the outset.

The legislators therefore saw fit to include the Act and Regulations and application process that would allow for changes in the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary. Moreover, the Commission deployed staff to review Agricultural Land Reserve designations in areas of the Province where the pressures for alternative development seemed greatest and where boundaries were drawn using small scale base information. This process of Agricultural Land Reserve boundary review was carried on in close association with regional districts and municipalities and became known as the process of Agricultural Land Reserve "fine-tuning". The review of an Agricultural Land Reserve boundary may result in adjustments by means of local government or Commission sponsored applications to Cabinet for exclusions and/or inclusions. These applications are first reviewed by the Environment and Land Use Committee of Cabinet.

Because of concerns that in certain regions of the Province (particularly in the beef farming areas of the Bulkley-Nechako and in the grazing lands of the Thompson-Nicola Regional District) designated Agricultural Land Reserves do no adequately include all the land capable of agricultural use, and because of growing evidence of inaccuracies in the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary on Vancouver Island, the Commission decided in 1979 to press for funds to enhance the Agricultural Land Reserve fine-tuning activities. A program was approved in the fall of 1979 and commenced spring 1980.

The co-operation and participation of the Terrestrial Studies Branch, Ministry of Environment and also the Soils Branch of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in this program is greatfully acknowledged.

The technical information being assembled will not only provide the basis for "fine-tuning" the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary, but will also be useful to other Provincial ministries, to regional districts and to local communities.

Enforcement of *The Soil Conservation Act*

In conjunction with local and regional authorities, the Commission administers the *Soil Conservation Act*. Problems have been encountered with the *Soil Conservation Act* particularly in areas of high-urban density, e.g., the Greater Vancouver Regional District. The major problem in areas such as this is the considerable volume of waste being excavated for urban buildings. Contractors have large quantities of fill to dispose of and few cheap and easily accessible areas for disposal. As a consequence, fill is sometimes placed on unused agricultural land either as a means of upgrading poor soil drainage or in some cases without the owner's knowledge. A considerable amount of time and effort has been spent by Commission staff monitoring this situation in conjunction with the local municipal staff.

Another major problem, also associated with construction, is the mining of gravel. There is considerable demand for gravel across the Province. Often gravel sources are overlain by a layer of loess (wind-blown material) which makes these soils very valuable as agricultural soils. The Commission realizes that there are two resources involved in these instances and that it should attempt to utilize both resources instead of one at the expense of the other. Commission staff have been instrumental in working with local authorities and applicants in developing appropriate conditions which will allow for gravel extraction and preserve agricultural land simultaneously.

Peat lands have recently come into focus as an area of concern within the Agricultural Land Reserves. There have been a number of recent studies on these areas to determine more about their characteristics. Until recently very little was known about their ecological interaction within ecosystems. The Commission staff is in the process of determining to what extent peat extraction should be allowed on wetlands, bogs and meadows across the Province.

To aid in the Commission's decision-making procedures, Commission staff have drafted a preliminary set of guidelines for use in applications under the *Soil Conservation Act*. These guidelines were formulated through extensive discussions with the staff of the Soils Branch, Ministry of Agriculture and Food. The preliminary guidelines will be sent to local authorities in the coming year to test their adequacy. After this testing period, the Commission staff will redraft the guidelines and produce a brochure which outlines procedures for application, the purpose of the *Soil Conservation Act*, exemptions from the *Soil Conservation Act* as well as the guidelines. It is hoped this will speed up the process and improve the quality of applications under the *Soil Conservation Act* received by the Commission.

Commission-Owned Farmlands

The original *Land Commission Act* of 1973 granted the Commission powers to acquire and dispose of land and an appropriation not to exceed $25,000,000. Some 22 land purchases were made during 1975 and 1976 and a long-term leasing program was developed. In addition to acquiring land through purchases from private owners, the Commission agreed to accept administrative responsibility for certain Crown-owned lands within the Agricultural Land Reserve; notably, farmlands purchased in 1972 and 1973 under the *Greenbelt Protection Fund Act*, surplus Ministry of Highways lands, and other special cases.

Under the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*, R.S. Chapter 9 (consolidated 22 December 1980) the Commission has powers to acquire and dispose of property. Commission-owned land may be leased; the sale of Commission owned land must be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Appropriations for land acquisition may be paid out of consolidated revenue fund on approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The relevant sections of the Act are 4 (1), 7 (c), 22 (a), 22 (c), and 32.

The objectives of the program are:

—to facilitate special community projects that would enhance the agricultural use of Agricultural Land Reserve lands or assist the farm community, e.g., approximately 810 hectares purchased near Vernon and made available under lease to the City of Vernon for effluent spray irrigation, East Kootenay acquisition to form a community pasture and assist rangeland and rehabilitation;

—to re-establish agriculture on Agricultural Land Reserve lands through parcel consolidation and leasing of viable farm units, e.g., the 809.7 hectare Langley farm project;

—to ensure the active farm use of highly visible Crown-owned Agricultural Land Reserve lands that had been purchased from farmers for various reasons, e.g., surplus Ministry of Highways lands; farms purchased under the *Greenbelt Protection Act*;

—to assist with certain hardship cases occurring at the time of Agricultural Land Reserve designations;

—the long-term lease program emphasizes 20-year leases to younger farmers with an option to purchase after three years successful farming. The criteria used in selecting lessees gives emphasis to those who are under-capitalized or have an insufficient land base to become fully viable. In most cases lessees are required to purchase buildings at the commencement of the lease.

As of 31 March 1981 the land holdings were:

—57 properties owned by the Commission totalling 4 251.0 hectares;

—23 properties administered for the Crown totalling 1 012.1 hectares;

—60 former Ministry of Highways properties (title with the Crown) totalling 404.9 hectares.

Included among the Commission-owned lands are three properties received by way of gifts which are managed in a semi-natural state in the interests of wildlife in accordance with agreements with the former owners.

The Commission limits its activity on this program to acquisition and disposal decisions and to establishing lease policy. Staff responsibility involves the work of Director of Property and Soil Management Division and one clerical support. Expenditure each year is limited to repurchase of lessee-owned improvements at the time of lease termination. Per annum expenditure on this item is $100–$250,000 per year and is a vote item under the Ministry of Agriculture and Food—Agricultural Land Commission. Revenue from the sale of properties goes to consolidated revenue and in 1980-81 totalled $1.4 million dollars.

The program is administered on a day-to-day basis by the Property Management Branch of the B.C. Ministry of Agriculture and Food. The program employs 3½ agrologists, 1 appraiser, and 2 clerical support. Administrative expenditures of $165,000 are covered in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food vote and $205,000 is provided for expenditures on taxes, maintenance and miscellaneous expenses. Revenues go to consolidated revenue and for 1980-81 totalled $375,373.

No land purchases have been made by the Commission since 1976 but a number of properties have been added to the program from Crown lands. The first lessees under the program became eligible to purchase in 1979 and seven properties were sold in 1979 and 1980.

Demand for these properties when they become available for lease is very high among active and perspective farmers meeting the selection criteria. The Commission believes that this demand indicates that the program is serving a genuine need for assistance to under-capitalized young farmers.

The Commission has held recent discussions with the Minister of Agriculture and Food on a plan to re-activate the Land Acquisition Program by using proceeds from the sale of properties. The concept would be to create a revolving fund amounting to perhaps $1,000,000 per annum.

In addition to providing a revolving inventory of land for leasing to young farmers, acquisition objectives would include:

—replotting and consolidation of small parcels into viable farm units;

—a vehicle for returning to productive agricultural-use lands in the Agricultural Land Reserve that are debilitated and/or unused due to current ownership;

—the securing of a land base at the Agricultural Land Reserve boundary for agricultural-industry support uses such as agricultural product-processing.

FINANCIAL REPORT

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES

For the Year Ended 31 March 1981

	Capital	Administrative	Total
Professional and special services	$ 5,173	$ 40,753	$ 45,926
Salaries	—	695,080	695,080
Travel	—	150,867	150,867
Commission members fees	—	132,359	132,359
Office expenses	—	32,659	32,659
Furniture and equipment	—	3,176	3,176
Materials and supplies, utilities and taxes	12,441	16,848	29,289
Rentals	—	664	664
Advertising and publications	—	6,676	6,676
Machinery and equipment	—	14,054	14,054
Grants	15,000	35,375	50,375
Totals	$32,614	$1,128,518	$1,161,125

(Prepared without audit)

NOTES—STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES

(a) During the year ended 31 March 1981, expenditures for administrative purposes fell into three program categories:

(i) Commission and Burnaby staff support, $811,426.
(ii) Agricultural Land Reserve enhanced fine-tuning Burnaby staff support, $69,570.
(iii) Agricultural Land Reserve enhanced fine-tuning Terrestrial Studies Branch staff support, $247,520.

(b) Expenditures for purchase of lessee-owned improvements on lease terminations totalled $382,653 for the year (Schedule I).

(c) Receipts from the sale of Commission properties totalled $1,411,041.33 for the year (Schedule II) and were paid to the Consolidated Revenue Account of the Government of British Columbia.

(d) Property Management Branch of the B.C. Ministry of Agriculture and Food reported that rent and other income from Commission-owned and administered properties totalled $303,476 and payments received on improvements sold to lessees amounted to $71,896. These monies were remitted to the Consolidated Revenue Account of the Province of British Columbia.

(e) Commission legal fees for the year that were paid by the Ministry of the Attorney General totalled $64,831.

Approved on behalf of the Commission.
M. F. CLARKE, *Chairman*
R. P. MURDOCH, *General Manager*

STATISTICS

Schedule III includes various ALR statistics to March 31, 1981. Please note that all figures are now in hectares and because of the conversion from acres to hectares, there may be some variance in the figures from our previous publications. Some figures may also have been

adjusted to correct any earlier errors. Another point to note is that all entries concerning the area of land are based on the actual date of decision not on the date in which the application is received.

The statistics now include information on the agricultural capability of the land. However, these figures have only been compiled since 1979. 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).

As at April 1, 1981, there were approximately 4 700 164 hectares of land in the ALR. A loss of some 5 755 hectares since our last report. A brief analysis of the figures has revealed that most of the land (76%) was excluded under Section 11 (1) of the Act by applications from the local governments and/or Commission reviews. Another 18% was excluded under Section 12 (1) of the Act (individual applications). These lands excluded were generally low in agricultural capability. The remaining area was a result of appeals to the ELUC. On the other hand, approximately 293 hectares were included in the ALR. These lands were at best of moderate capability.

SCHEDULE I

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES ON LEASE TERMINATIONS FOR PURCHASE OF IMPROVEMENTS

Property	Lessee	Improvements Purchased	Amount
No. 31	R. Ross	Orchard (trees)	$ 28,434
No. 22.14	Stewart & Edwards	Clearing costs	4,545
No. 22.20	Schmidt	Dairy farm (dwelling, barn and pens, bunker, silo, well, roads, manure pit, miscellaneous site improvements, milking equipment, land clearing, seeding and development, drainage and fencing	262,878
No. 28	Judge	Dairy farm (dwelling, dairy equipment and installation, barn improvements, bunker, silo, manure pit, and water system	87,796
	Total		$382,653

Provincial Agricultural Land Commission Statutory Account Order in Council 1028 — May 1980.

SCHEDULE II

RECEIPTS FROM THE SALE OF PROPERTY

Property	Location	Purchaser	Date of Sale	Sale Price
No. 31	Kelowna	Solmer Bros.	June 27, 1980	$ 120,610.66
No. 22.4	Langley Farms	Connor	January 15, 1981	703,639.53
No. 22.6	Langley Farms	Clayton	January 31, 1981	140,635.30
No. 22.21	Langley Farms	Arbour	December 31, 1980	155,419.54
No. 22.8 (b)	Langley Farms	McDonnell	March 1, 1981	290,736.30
	Total			$1,411,041.33

SCHEDULE III

AREA INCLUDED AND EXCLUDED FROM THE AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE BY YEAR
(All Figures are in Hectares)

Type of Application	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
Inclusions	*Nil*	6 065.0	516.9	4 300.0	19 141.0	3 251.5	249.6	118.9	33 642.9
Exclusions:									
11 (1)	212.9	1 777.3	1 375.5	16 271.3	8 492.3	7 260.5	4 304.3	3 158.4	42 852.5
12 (1)	379.2	1 190.1	932.2	2 490.3	1 913.8	2 175.0	1 496.8	200.8	10 778.2
13 (1)	*Nil*	164.0	49.0	199.6	8.5	52.2	10.5	61.5	545.3
13 (2)	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	66.0	270.8	260.8	*Nil*	597.6
Total Acreage Excluded	592.1	3 723.5	2 356.7	18 961.2	10 480.6	9 758.5	6 072.4	3 420.7	54 773.6

Total ALR area at designation	4 721 295.3
Total area included since designation	33 642.9
Total area excluded under 11 (1)	42 853.5
Total area excluded under 12 (1)	10 778.2
Total area excluded under 13 (1)	545.3
Total area excluded under 13 (2)	597.6
Current ALR area as at April 1, 1981	4 700 164.6

SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS CONSIDERED UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION ACT

(All Figures are Cumulative)

12 (1) SUMMARY

(Applications by an owner to exclude land from the ALR)

Number of applications	2,257
Hectares requested for exclusion	41 994.0
Land Commission decision:	
Remain in ALR	19 287.2
Exclude	10 788.2
Allow 20 (1)	11 928.6

11 (1) SUMMARY

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

Number of applications	129
Hectares requested for exclusion	54 395.4
Land Commission recommendation:	
Allow	41 965.3
Refuse	12 430.1
Cabinet decision:	
Allow	42 852.5
Refuse	11 527.9

INCLUSION SUMMARY

(Applications to include land into the ALR)

Applications*	95
Hectares requested for inclusion	48 946.8
Land Commission recommendation:	
Allow	44 495.9
Refuse	4 450.9
Cabinet decision:	
Allow	33 642.9
Refuse	13 831.6

April 1, 1981

CURRENT ALR AREA BY REGIONAL DISTRICT

Regional District	Approximate Area at Date of Designation	Inclusions	Area Excluded				Approximate Area as of April 1, 1981
			11 (1)	12 (1)	13 (1)	13 (2)	
erni-Clayoquot	7 935.2	—	—	56.7	—	—	7 878.5
lkley-Nechako	297 611.3	—	77.6	177.6	58.7	6.1	297 291.3
pital	19 595.1	130.0	660.4	543.2	—	—	18 521.5
ribоо	925 506.1	4 318.2	13 546.7	1 170.5	—	61.9	915 045.2
ntral Coast	4 453.4	—	—	27.8	—	—	4 425.6
ntral Fraser Valley	55 344.1	2.9	1 677.7	353.1	14.6	260.3	53 041.3
ntral Kootenay	71 538.5	445.5	4 315.0	331.4	2.8	—	67 334.8
ntral Okanagan	33 076.9	91.5	192.5	462.1	10.5	—	32 503.3
lumbia-Shuswap	67 408.8	199.5	6 109.1	752.7	171.7	—	60 574.9
mox-Strathcona	43 724.7	3 572.9	5 041.6	824.3	—	—	41 431.7
wichan Valley	21 983.8	6.6	506.0	366.6	—	36.0	21 081.8
wdney-Alouette	23 765.2	480.2	2 744.6	85.1	—	—	21 415.7
st Kootenay	272 510.1	—	124.6	1 628.0	—	66.0	270 691.5
ser-Cheam	36 761.1	0.8	354.9	134.0	55.4	—	36 217.6
ser-Fort George	349 635.6	21 642.1	287.1	522.1	—	—	370 468.5
ater Vancouver	32 550.6	1.2	383.7	141.0	4.4	—	32 022.7
imat-Stikine	64 170.0	2 072.9	120.6	129.1	—	—	65 993.2
otenay Boundary	55 060.7	—	34.4	99.9	159.5	—	54 766.9
unt Waddington	1 740.9	—	—	—	—	—	1 740.9
naimo	21 052.6	171.3	10.9	308.6	55.0	—	20 849.4
rth Okanagan	70 283.4	10.1	160.7	390.7	4.1	—	69 738.0
anagan-Similkameen	86 477.7	104.5	86.4	381.0	4.5	—	86 110.3
ace River-Liard	1 498 987.9	14.2	—	799.3	—	—	1 498 202.8
well River	14 129.6	—	3 284.4	22.6	—	—	10 822.6
eena-Queen Charlotte	43 886.6	—	—	166.6	—	—	43 719.9
uamish-Lillooet	27 125.5	—	167.9	82.5	—	6.9	26 868.2
nshine Coast	6 275.3	—	1 818.8	212.8	4.1	—	4 239.6
mpson-Nicola	568 704.5	378.5	1 146.9	608.8	—	160.4	567 166.9
Totals	4 721 295.3	33 642.9	42 852.5	10 778.2	545.3	597.6	4 700 164.6

AREA OF LAND INCLUDED IN THE ALR SINCE DESIGNATION (BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR)
(in Hectares)

Regional District	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
Capital	12.1	15.0	6.1	—	3.2	2.9	90.7	130.0
Cariboo	—	—	4 016.2	—	298.0	—	4.0	4 318.2
Central Fraser Valley	—	—	—	—	—	2.9	—	2.9
Central Kootenay	—	—	—	323.9	—	121.6	—	445.5
Central Okanagan	—	1.6	26.3	—	—	63.6	—	91.5
Columbia-Shuswap	12.1	—	—	19.0	131.2	13.0	24.2	199.5
Comox-Strathcona	—	429.1	189.5	179.8	2 774.5	—	—	3,572.9
Cowichan Valley	—	2.0	—	—	—	4.6	—	6.6
Dewdney-Alouette	17.0	—	—	463.2	—	—	—	480.2
Fraser-Cheam	—	—	0.8	—	—	—	—	0.8
Fraser-Fort George	3 569.2	—	—	18 072.9	—	—	—	21 642.1
Greater Vancouver	—	—	1.2	—	—	—	—	1.2
Kitimat-Stikine	2 072.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 072.9
Nanaimo	20.6	49.8	59.9	8.1	—	32.9	—	171.3
North Okanagan	—	10.1	—	—	—	—	—	10.1
Okanagan-Similkameen	—	—	—	74.1	30.4	—	—	104.5
Peace River-Liard	—	—	—	—	14.2	—	—	14.2
Thompson-Nicola	361.1	9.3	—	—	—	8.1	—	378.5
Totals	6 065.0	516.9	4 300.0	19 141.0	3 251.5	249.6	118.9	33,642.9

1979, 1980 and First Quarter 1981

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

Regional District	Total Area Included (Hectares)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY*			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
pital	96.8	28.1	59.7	3.2	5.8
riboo	302.0	—	267.2	—	34.8
ntral Fraser Valley	2.9	2.9	—	—	—
ntral Kootenay	121.6	28.5	—	1.6	91.5
ntral Okanagan	63.6	28.0	—	—	35.6
lumbia-Shuswap	168.3	88.6	—	4.9	74.8
mox-Strathcona	2 774.5	159.9	2 614.6	—	—
wichan Valley	4.6	2.0	—	—	2.6
naimo	32.9	14.1	—	0.4	18.4
anagan-Similkameen	30.4	30.4	—	—	—
ace River-Liard	14.2	—	—	—	14.2
ompson-Nicola	8.1	4.1	—	—	4.0
Totals	3 619.9	386.6	2 941.5	10.1	281.7

1979, 1980 and First Quarter 1981

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS REFUSED FOR INCLUSION UNDER SECTION 10 (3) AND 10 (5)
(By Order in Council)

Regional District	Total Areas Refused for Inclusion (Hectares)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY*			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
Capital	6.5	6.5	—	—	—
Columbia-Shuswap	1.2	—	—	—	1.2
East Kootenay	25.8	—	—	—	25.8
Fraser-Fort George	4.1	1.2	—	—	2.9
Kitimat-Stikine	10 850.2	—	—	10 850.2	—
Kootenay Boundary	8.1	—	—	—	8.1
Totals	10,895.9	7.7	—	10,850.2	38.0

* Agricultural Capability Legend (Improved Ratings)

INCLUSION SUMMARY SHEET BY REGIONAL DISTRICT AS OF APRIL 1, 1981
(Cumulative Figures)

Regional District	Number of Applications In Which Decisions Have Been Made	Hectares Requested for Inclusion	Hectares Recommended for Inclusion by the Agricultural Land Commission	Hectares Approved for Inclusion by Cabinet
Bulkley-Nechako	6	2 874.5	—	—
Capital	9	139.4	130.0	130.0
Cariboo	4	4 318.2	4 318.2	4 318.2
Central Coast	1	20.2	—	—
Central Fraser Valley	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
Central Kootenay	4	445.5	445.5	445.5
Central Okanagan	4	91.5	91.5	91.5
Columbia-Shuswap	9	276.4	199.5	199.5
Comox-Strathcona	6	3 604.5	3,572.9	3,572.9
Cowichan Valley	2	6.6	6.6	6.6
Dewdney-Alouette	6	511.7	480.2	480.2
East Kootenay	1	25.8	—	—
Fraser-Cheam	1	0.8	0.8	0.8
Fraser-Fort George	8	22 796.0	21 642.1	21 642.1
Greater Vancouver	2	3.2	1.2	1.2
Kitimat-Stikine	2	12 923.1	12 932.1	2 072.9
Kootenay Boundary	3	8.1	—	—
Nanaimo	16	380.2	171.3	171.3
North Okanagan	1	10.1	10.1	10.1
Okanagan-Similkameen	4	115.4	107.3	104.5
Peace River-Liard	1	14.2	14.2	14.2
Thompson-Nicola	4	378.5	378.5	378.5
Totals	95	48 946.8	44 495.9	33 642.9

HECTARES EXCLUDED BY CABINET UNDER SECTION 11 (1) APPLICATIONS (BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR)

Regional District	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
kley-Nechako	—	4.0	44.5	29.1	—	—	—	—	77.6
pital	—	232.7	—	41.7	25.5	—	—	269.5	660.4
riboo	—	79.7	—	9 215.2	—	2 569.8	—	1 682.0	13 546.7
ntral Fraser Valley	144.5	—	102.0	303.5	61.9	89.9	—	976.0	1 677.7
ntral Kootenay	—	14.6	40.5	—	3 553.1	—	706.8	—	4 315.0
ntral Okanagan	—	—	—	—	100.0	—	92.5	—	192.5
lumbia-Shuswap	—	206.8	154.6	235.9	1 824.3	952.6	2 734.9	—	6 109.1
mox-Strathcona	—	—	590.8	766.5	189.4	3 494.9	—	—	5 041.6
wichan Valley	—	75.3	1.2	153.8	—	—	275.7	—	506.0
wdney-Alouette	60.7	24.3	—	—	2 659.6	—	—	—	2 744.6
st Kootenay	—	—	—	56.6	—	—	68.0	—	124.6
ser-Cheam	—	—	6.5	271.1	—	—	77.3	—	354.9
ser-Fort George	—	—	—	—	—	93.1	194.0	—	287.1
ater Vancouver	—	—	147.7	—	8.1	3.6	—	224.3	383.7
mat-Stikine	—	—	120.6	—	—	—	—	—	120.6
tenay Boundary	—	34.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	34.4
naimo	—	—	—	—	10.9	—	—	—	10.9
th Okanagan	1.6	66.8	1.6	80.5	—	—	10.2	—	160.7
nagan-Similkameen	6.1	—	10.1	—	—	56.7	6.9	6.6	86.4
Fvell River	—	—	—	3 284.4	—	—	—	—	3 284.4
Juamish-Lillooet	—	12.5	155.4	—	—	—	—	—	167.9
Sshine Coast	—	—	—	1 818.8	—	—	—	—	1 818.8
Tompson-Nicola	—	935.2	—	14.2	59.5	—	138.0	—	1 146.9
Totals	212.9	1 777.3	1 375.5	16 271.3	8 492.3	7 260.5	4 304.3	3 158.4	42 852.5

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS EXCLUDED BY APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 11 (1) (By Order in Council) (All Figures in Hectares)

Regional District	Total Area Excluded	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY*			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
Capital	296.5	62.4	—	—	207.1
Cariboo	4 251.8	—	40.5	—	4 211.3
Central Fraser Valley	1 065.8	35.5	96.6	362.3	571.4
Central Kootenay	706.8	2.8	24.3	—	679.7
Central Okanagan	92.5	29.3	4.9	—	58.3
Columbia-Shuswap	3 687.5	64.1	3.0	47.5	3 572.9
Comox-Strathcona	3 494.9	5.7	—	1 279.2	2,210.0
Cowichan Valley	275.7	55.9	—	66.8	153.0
East Kootenay	68.0	6.9	—	—	61.1
Fraser-Cheam	77.3	—	—	—	77.3
Fraser-Fort George	287.1	10.1	—	—	277.0
Greater Vancouver	227.9	128.2	39.6	—	60.1
North Okanagan	10.2	10.2	—	—	—
Okanagan-Similkameen	70.2	3.6	—	4.4	62.2
Thompson-Nicola	138.0	17.0	—	42.0	79.0
Totals	14 723.2	431.7	208.9	1 802.2	12 280.4

* Agricultural Capability Legend (Improved Ratings).

A. Prime—Totally Class 1–3.

B. Complex: Prime.

Dominant—Major portion of unit is prime land.

C. Complex: Prime Subordinate—Lesser portion of unit is prime land.

D. Secondary—Class 4–7.

RICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS REFUSED FOR EXCLUSION BY APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 11 (1) (By Order in Council) (All Figures in Hectares)

Regional District	Total Area Refused	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY*			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
ital	10.3	10.3	—	—	—
tral Fraser Valley	34.4	19.4	—	—	15.0
tral Kootenay	1 569.2	1 255.1	—	—	314.1
tral Okanagan	376.7	284.0	—	92.7	—
mbia-Shuswap	1 502.4	83.0	—	—	1 419.4
ichan Valley	10.1	10.1	—	—	—
ser-Cheam	9.3	7.3	—	—	2.0
ater Vancouver	21.5	18.2	—	—	3.3
th Okanagan	127.1	99.3	19.8	—	8.0
nagan-Similkameen	534.4	125.1	10.1	—	399.2
ell River	16.2	14.2	—	—	2.0
mpson-Nicola	325.0	42.0	148.0	—	135.0
Totals	4 536.6	1 968.0	177.9	92.7	2 298.0

* Agricultural Capability Legend (Improved Ratings).
A. Prime—Totally Class 1–3.
B. Complex: Prime.
Dominant—Major portion of unit is prime land.
C. Complex: Prime Subordinate—Lesser portion of unit is prime land.
D. Secondary—Class 4–7.

11 (1) SUMMARY SHEET BY REGIONAL DISTRICT (CUMULATIVE FIGURES)

Regional Districts	Number of Applications	Hectares Requested for Exclusion	Hectares Recommended for Exclusion by Land Commission	Hectares Approved for Exclusion by Cabinet
Bulkley-Nechako	4	800.0	77.6	77.6
Capital	7	862.0	635.1	660.4
Cariboo	7	13 952.0	13 546.7	13 546.7
Central Fraser Valley	13	2 318.5	1 779.3	1 677.7
Central Kootenay	7	5 894.7	4 315.0	4 315.0
Central Okanagan	5	728.3	195.7	192.5
Columbia-Shuswap	19	7 769.3	6 106.5	6 109.1
Comox-Strathcona	8	5 050.2	5 041.6	5,041.6
Cowichan Valley	6	1 148.1	384.2	506.0
Dewdney-Alouette	6	3 309.3	2 609.3	2 744.6
East Kootenay	3	310.9	68.0	124.6
Fraser-Cheam	5	1 220.2	354.9	354.9
Fraser-Fort George	2	287.1	287.1	287.1
Greater Vancouver	9	598.5	41.8	383.7
Kitimat-Stikine	1	311.8	120.6	120.6
Kootenay Boundary	1	52.7	34.4	34.4
Nanaimo	2	15.4	10.9	10.9
North Okanagan	8	693.6	160.7	160.7
Okanagan-Similkameen	5	620.8	84.2	86.4
Powell River	2	3 302.0	3 284.4	3 284.4
Squamish-Lillooet	2	248.2	46.6	167.9
Sunshine Coast	2	1 819.4	1 818.8	1 818.8
Thompson-Nicola	5	3 082.4	961.9	1 146.9
Totals	129	54 395.4	41 965.3	42 852.5

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS GIVEN APPROVAL FOR SUBDIVISION AND/OR USE BY APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 11 (2)
(By Order in Council) for 1980 (All Figures in Hectares)

Regional District	Total Area Approved	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
Kootenay	9.0	9.0	—	—	—
nagan-Similkameen	29.1	13.2	—	—	15.9
enay Boundary	2.0	—	—	2.0	—
Totals	40.1	22.2	—	2.0	15.9

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS REFUSED FOR SUBDIVISION AND/OR USE BY APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 11 (2)
(By Order in Council) for 1980 (All Figures in Hectares)

Regional District	Total Area Refused	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
er Vancouver	1.1	1.1	—	—	—
al Fraser Valley	1.1	—	—	—	1.1
r-Cheam	58.3	28.7	—	—	29.6
al Okanagan	17.4	17.4	—	—	—
Totals for 1980	77.9	47.2	—	—	30.7

HECTARES EXCLUDED BY COMMISSION RESOLUTION UNDER 12 (1) APPLICATIONS (BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR)

Regional District	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
Alberni-Clayoquot	—	—	—	—	39.7	—	5	12	56.
Bulkley-Nechako	—	21.0	—	53.8	68.4	26.3	8.1	—	177.
Capital	4.5	137.6	28.3	100.4	43.7	155.8	71.7	1.2	543.
Cariboo	—	67.6	43.7	80.5	82.6	801.7	91.7	2.7	1 170.
Central Coast	—	—	20.2	2.0	3.6	—	2.0	—	27.
Central Fraser Valley	31.6	54.2	1.2	155.0	24.7	81.7	4.7	—	353.
Central Kootenay	2.4	12.5	22.3	100.4	122.2	36.4	1.2	34.0	331.
Central Okanagan	—	113.3	23.5	79.3	127.5	34.4	84.1	—	462.
Columbia-Shuswap	16.2	197.9	140.4	172.0	90.2	85.8	50.2	—	752.
Comox-Strathcona	109.7	119.4	184.9	286.1	82.1	4.5	37.6	—	824.
Cowichan Valley	38.8	69.6	57.9	55.8	46.1	78.5	19.9	—	366.
Dewdney-Alouette	8.9	4.9	10.9	—	32.4	20.2	7.8	—	85.
East Kootenay	—	95.1	62.7	801.3	255.0	114.1	251.7	48.1	1 628.
Fraser-Cheam	—	3.6	5.3	20.2	36.8	13.8	47.8	6.5	134.
Fraser-Fort George	—	—	—	46.9	244.0	68.0	163.2	—	522.
Greater Vancouver	24.7	11.7	2.8	64.7	5.3	12.1	19.7	—	141.
Kitimat-Stikine	—	31.6	—	—	58.3	2.0	37.2	—	129.
Kootenay Boundary	—	7.3	11.7	—	35.6	45.3	—	—	99.
Nanaimo	—	69.2	24.7	80.9	73.7	21.0	39.1	—	308.
North Okanagan	35.2	99.1	12.1	34.0	151.4	32.0	26.8	0.1	390.
Okanagan-Similkameen	70.8	13.8	12.9	130.3	104.8	41.3	6.4	0.7	381.
Peace River-Liard	—	—	—	23.9	92.7	477.9	204.8	—	799.
Powell River	—	19.4	1.6	1.6	—	—	—	—	22.
Skeena-Queen Charlotte	—	—	21.0	—	—	—	145.7	—	166.
Squamish-Lillooet	—	2.0	48.2	6.1	2.0	14.2	10.0	—	82.
Sunshine Coast	36.4	7.7	—	31.6	37.6	4.0	—	95.5	212.
Thompson-Nicola	—	31.6	195.9	163.5	53.4	4.0	160.4	—	608.
Totals	379.2	1 190.1	932.2	2 490.3	1 913.8	2 175.0	1 496.8	200.8	10 778.

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY OF AREAS EXCLUDED BY APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 12 (1)

Regional District	Total Area Excluded (Hectares)	AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY*			
		Prime	Prime Dominant	Prime Subordinate	Secondary
erni-Clayoquot	17.0	5.0	—	—	12.0
kley-Nechako	34.4	—	—	26.3	8.1
ital	228.7	110.0	8.1	—	110.6
boo	896.1	1.2	4.0	23.9	867.0
tral Coast	2.0	2.0	—	—	—
tral Fraser Valley	86.4	0.4	—	—	86.0
tral Kootenay	71.6	6.5	4.9	—	60.2
tral Okanagan	118.5	24.7	72.8	—	21.0
umbia-Shuswap	136.0	14.1	12.1	24.7	85.1
nox-Strathcona	42.1	16.7	2.4	7.1	15.9
ichan Valley	98.4	20.5	4.5	—	73.4
dney-Alouette	28.0	1.3	—	—	26.7
t Kootenay	413.9	33.5	8.7	12.1	359.6
ser-Cheam	68.1	42.1	—	—	26.0
ser-Fort George	231.2	—	—	—	231.2
ater Vancouver	31.8	13.3	3.6	—	14.9
nat-Stikine	39.2	—	—	18.2	21.0
tenay Boundary	45.3	—	—	—	45.3
aimo	60.1	3.2	0.4	—	56.5
h Okanagan	58.9	30.8	—	—	28.1
nagan-Similkameen	48.4	3.0	19.8	0.4	25.2
ce River-Liard	682.7	564.4	28.3	24.3	65.7
lena-Queen Charlotte	145.7	—	40.5	40.5	64.7
amish-Lillooet	24.2	14.2	—	—	10.0
shine Coast	99.5	—	—	20.0	79.5
mpson-Nicola	164.4	23.3	—	—	141.1
Totals	3 872.6	930.2	210.1	197.5	2 534.8

Agricultural Capability Legend (Improved Ratings).

A. Prime—Totally Class 1–3.

B. Complex: Prime.
Dominant—Major portion of unit is prime land.

C. Complex: Prime Subordinate—Lesser portion of unit is prime land.

D. Secondary—Class 4–7.

April 1, 1981

12 (1) SUMMARY SHEET (Cumulative Figures)

Regional District	Number of Applications (Decisions Made)	Number of Hectares Requested for Exclusion	Regional District Recommendations (Ha)				Commission Decision (Ha)		
			Remain in ALR	Exclude	*Allow* 20 (1)	No Comment	*Remain* In ALR	Exclude	*Allow* 20 (1)
Alberni-Clayoquot	13	161.1	8.9	62.8	3.2	86.2	68.0	56.7	36.4
Bulkley-Nechako	50	1 782.6	835.1	854.5	24.6	68.4	1 066.0	177.6	539.0
Capital	139	1 684.0	920.8	356.6	10.1	396.5	824.3	543.2	316.5
Cariboo	119	3 806.2	821.4	2 180.3	170.4	634.1	1 723.7	1 170.5	912.0
Central Coast	8	93.8	8.9	70.4	14.5	—	3.6	27.8	62.4
Central Fraser Valley	136	1 876.8	1 007.1	761.7	102.4	5.6	1 182.2	353.1	341.5
Central Kootenay	109	921.9	—	—	—	921.9	241.4	331.4	349.1
Central Okanagan	174	1 834.0	510.6	1 118.5	77.7	127.2	997.2	462.1	374.7
Columbia-Shuswap	189	2 247.9	702.7	1 252.5	224.7	68.0	778.3	752.7	716.9
Comox-Strathcona	153	2 501.3	653.9	1 273.9	54.2	519.3	796.4	824.3	880.6
Cowichan Valley	182	1 523.3	529.0	697.3	140.4	156.6	645.5	366.6	511.2
Dewdney-Alouette	48	652.6	230.6	219.4	19.7	182.9	486.5	85.1	81.0
East Kootenay	143	8 519.9	25.4	647.0	36.9	7 810.6	4 564.2	1 628.0	2,327.7
Fraser-Cheam	53	511.1	25.8	252.4	42.9	190.0	229.9	134.0	147.2
Fraser-Fort George	37	1 742.5	460.7	513.1	405.9	362.8	590.1	522.1	630.3
Greater Vancouver	52	612.8	538.0	72.0	—	2.0	459.5	141.0	12.3
Kitimat-Stikine	15	372.1	95.9	153.4	84.0	38.8	17.4	129.1	225.6
Kootenay Boundary	21	306.3	57.0	234.7	7.7	6.9	186.6	99.9	19.8
Nanaimo	132	1 629.8	429.0	669.4	54.6	476.8	907.8	308.6	413.4
North Okanagan	115	1 557.2	212.6	697.8	433.9	212.9	287.2	390.7	879.3
Okanagan-Similkameen	128	1 611.3	114.1	1 266.2	43.7	187.3	443.7	381.0	786.6
Peace River-Liard	77	2 538.4	830.5	1 111.1	15.5	581.3	1 363.3	799.3	375.8
Powell River	9	55.4	14.2	39.2	2.0	—	30.4	22.6	2.4
Skeena-Queen Charlotte	5	230.7	63.9	166.8	—	—	29.6	166.7	34.4
Squamish-Lillooet	24	329.3	21.8	284.0	7.3	16.2	83.4	82.5	163.4
Sunshine Coast	37	664.2	177.7	11.3	—	475.2	387.5	212.8	63.9
Thompson-Nicola	89	2 227.5	40.5	337.0	41.3	1 808.7	893.5	608.8	725.2
Totals*	2 257	41 994.0	9 336.9	15 303.3	2 017.6	15 336.2	19 287.2	10 778.2	11 928.6

* All figures are approximate.

NUMBER OF REQUESTS FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL TO THE COMMISSION PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 (1) OF THE ACT (BY REGIONAL DISTRICT BY YEAR)

Regional District	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
ni-Clayoquot	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	2
ey-Nechako	—	—	—	—	3	4	1	—	8
al	—	—	—	—	1	4	2	—	7
oo	—	—	—	—	1	3	4	—	8
al Fraser Valley	—	2	1	3	3	2	3	—	14
al Kootenay	—	1	—	—	2	—	2	—	5
al Okanagan	—	3	2	3	3	5	2	3	21
nbia-Shuswap	—	—	—	1	—	2	2	—	5
ox-Strathcona	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	4
chan Valley	—	1	2	2	4	3	2	—	14
lney-Alouette	—	—	2	—	1	1	1	—	5
Kootenay	—	—	—	—	7	8	3	1	19
er-Cheam	—	—	1	—	—	4	1	—	6
er-Fort George	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
er Vancouver	—	—	—	—	1	2	1	1	5
nay Boundary	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
imo	—	—	3	3	5	5	2	1	19
Okanagan	—	—	1	—	1	1	2	1	6
agan-Similkameen	2	1	—	—	1	2	1	—	7
e River-Liard	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2
mish-Lillooet	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	2
nine Coast	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	3
upson-Nicola	—	—	—	—	2	3	1	—	6
Totals	2	9	14	14	39	52	32	8	170

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

Regional District	Number Requested	Commission			E.L.U.C.	
		Allow	Refuse	Other	Allow	Refus
Alberni-Clayoquot	2	—	1	1	—	—
Bulkley-Nechako	8	2	5	1	2	—
Capital	7	—	7	—	—	—
Cariboo	8	1	7	—	1	—
Central Fraser Valley	14	1	12	1	1	—
Central Kootenay	5	2	1	2	1	—
Central Okanagan	21	3	16	2	1	1
Columbia-Shuswap	5	1	3	1	1	—
Comox-Strathcona	4	—	4	—	—	—
Cowichan Valley	14	—	14	—	—	—
Dewdney-Alouette	5	—	5	—	—	—
East Kootenay	19	2	15	2	—	—
Fraser-Cheam	6	2	4	—	2	—
Fraser-Fort George	1	—	—	1	—	—
Greater Vancouver	5	1	3	1	1	—
Kootenay Boundary	1	1	—	—	1	—
Nanaimo	19	4	12	3	3	1
North Okanagan	6	1	5	—	1	—
Okanagan-Similkameen	7	1	6	—	1	—
Peace River-Liard	2	—	1	1	—	—
Squamish-Lillooet	2	1	1	—	1	—
Sunshine Coast	3	1	2	—	1	—
Thompson-Nicola	6	—	6	—	—	—
Totals	170	24	130	16	19	2

ACREAGE EXCLUDED BY THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE AS A 13 (1) APPEAL (By Regional District by Year) (All Figures in Hectares)

Regional District	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
Bulkley-Nechako	—	—	—	—	—	—	58.7	58.
Central Fraser Valley	—	—	14.6	—	—	—	—	14.
Central Kootenay	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.8	2.
Central Okanagan	—	—	—	—	—	10.5	—	10.
Columbia-Shuswap	—	—	171.7	—	—	—	—	171.
Fraser-Cheam	—	—	3.2	—	52.2	—	—	55.
Greater Vancouver	—	—	—	4.4	—	—	—	4.
Kootenay Boundary	159.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	159.
Nanaimo	—	44.9	10.1	—	—	—	—	55.
North Okanagan	—	—	—	4.1	—	—	—	4.
Okanagan-Similkameen	4.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.
Sunshine Coast	—	4.1	—	—	—	—	—	4.
Totals	164.0	49.0	199.6	8.5	52.2	10.5	61.5	545.

April 1, 1981

NUMBER OF REQUESTS FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL TO THE MINISTER PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 (2) OF THE ACT (By Regional District by Year)

Regional District	1978	1979	1980	First Quarter of 1981	Total
Alberni-Clayoquot	1	—	—	—	1
Bulkley-Nechako	1	2	1	—	4
Capital	2	2	2	—	6
Cariboo	—	2	4	—	6
Central Fraser Valley	—	3	4	—	7
Central Okanagan	1	3	—	3	7
Columbia-Shuswap	—	—	1	—	1
Cowichan Valley	—	—	1	—	1
Fraser-Cheam	1	2	3	—	6
Greater Vancouver	1	—	1	—	2
Kootenay	2	5	2	—	9
Mount Waddington	—	2	—	—	2
Nanaimo	—	2	1	—	3
North Okanagan	3	3	2	1	9
Okanagan-Similkameen	—	—	3	1	4
Peace River-Liard	—	1	1	—	2
Squamish-Lillooet	—	—	—	1	1
Sunshine Coast	—	1	—	—	1
Thompson-Nicola	1	—	—	—	1
Totals	1	2	2	—	5
	14	30	28	6	78

13 (2) CERTIFICATE OF LEAVE SUMMARY SHEET

April 1, 1981

(Environment and Land Use Committee shown as E.L.U.C.)

Regional District	Number Requested	Commission			E.L.U.C.	
		Allow	Refuse	Other	Allow	Refuse
Alberni-Clayoquot	1	—	1	—	—	—
Bulkley-Nechako	4	3	1	—	2	—
Capital	6	2	4	—	—	2
Cariboo	6	2	1	3	1	—
Central Fraser Valley	7	2	5	—	1	1
Central Okanagan	7	2	4	1	—	1
Columbia-Shuswap	1	—	1	—	—	—
Cowichan Valley	1	—	1	—	—	—
Fraser-Cheam	6	3	3	—	2	1
Greater Vancouver	2	1	1	—	1	—
Kootenay	9	6	2	1	4	1
Mount Waddington	2	—	—	2	—	—
Nanaimo	3	2	1	—	—	1
North Okanagan	9	1	7	1	—	1
Okanagan-Similkameen	4	1	2	1	—	1
Peace River-Liard	2	—	1	1	—	—
Squamish-Lillooet	1	1	—	—	—	—
Sunshine Coast	1	1	—	—	—	1
Thompson-Nicola	1	1	—	—	—	1
Totals	5	3	2	—	3	—
	78	31	37	10	14	11

AREA EXCLUDED BY THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
AS A 13 (2) APPEAL (By Regional District by Year)

Regional District	1978	1979	1980	Total (Hectares)
Bulkley-Nechako	—	—	6.1	6.1
Cariboo	—	—	61.9	61.9
Central Fraser Valley	—	260.3	—	260.3
Cowichan Valley	1.6	10.5	23.9	36.0
East Kootenay	33.6	—	32.4	66.0
Squamish-Lillooet	—	—	6.9	6.9
Thompson-Nicola	30.8	—	129.6	160.4
Totals	66.0	270.8	260.8	597.6

Queen's Printer for British Columbia ©
Victoria, 1981