



A NEW DIRECTION

Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Forum
January 8-9, 1999 • Summary Report



Fisheries and Oceans
Canada

Pêches et Océans
Canada

Canada

A NEW DIRECTION

Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Forum

Summary Report

Empire Landmark Hotel

Vancouver, B.C.

January 8-9, 1999

Steering Committee:

B.C. Aboriginal Fisheries Commission

Pacific Salmon Foundation

Salmon Enhancement and Habitat Advisory Board

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Forum Organizer:

Mel Kotyk

Forum facilitation and report preparation by:

Dovetail Consulting Inc.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	4
2	FORUM OVERVIEW	5
2.1	Background	5
2.1.1	Coho Response and Fisheries Restructuring Package	5
2.1.2	A New Direction for Canada's Pacific Salmon Fisheries	6
2.2	Forum Objectives	6
2.3	Scope of Discussions	7
2.4	Forum Steering Committee & Convening Partners	7
2.5	Forum Discussion Framework	8
2.6	Forum Agenda-At-A-Glance	9
3	FORUM RESULTS	10
3.1	Opening Presentation: The State of Habitat the Pacific Region	10
3.2	Keynote Presentation: <i>A New Direction</i>	11
3.3	Panel: Cooperative Watershed Planning & Management at the Provincial, State and River Basin Scale	15
3.4	Panel: Opportunities to Participate in Existing Planning Processes to Protect and Enhance Fish Habitat	19
3.5	Panel: Case Studies Of Cooperative Planning and Management at the Watershed Level	28
3.6	Presentation: The Need for Community Groups to Move to Advocacy for the Protection of Fish Habitat	32
3.7	Presentation: A First Nations Perspective	34
3.8	Presentation: Overview of the Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Program	35
3.9	Working Group Results	39
3.9.1	Linking <i>A New Direction</i> with Existing Multi-stakeholder Watershed Stewardship Initiatives	39
3.9.2	Linking <i>A New Direction</i> with Provincial Crown Land Use Planning	42
3.9.3	Linking <i>A New Direction</i> with Growth Management Planning	43
3.9.4	Building Bridges between <i>A New Direction</i> and First Nations	44
3.9.5	Linking <i>A New Direction</i> with the Yukon Land Claims Umbrella Final Agreement	47
3.9.6	Linking <i>A New Direction</i> with Water Use Planning	48
3.9.7	Refining Principles for Watershed Planning and Management: Towards a New Model	49
3.9.8	Linking <i>A New Direction</i> with Industry and Developers	51
3.9.9	The Role of Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators	53
3.9.10	Urban Watersheds	54
3.10	Concluding Comments from Steering Committee	56
3.10.1	Fred Fortier, BC Aboriginal Fisheries Commission	56
3.10.2	Rich Chapple, Pacific Salmon Foundation	56
3.10.3	Tom Cadieux, Salmon Enhancement and Habitat Advisory Board	56
3.10.4	Ted Perry, Habitat and Enhancement Branch	57
4	APPENDICES	58
4.1	Summary of Evaluation Forms	58
4.2	Attendees	60

1 INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes the results of the *A New Direction: Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Forum*, held in Vancouver on January 8-9, 1999.

The forum brought together representatives from Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), from other provincial and federal agencies, from First Nations governments, regional and municipal governments, fisheries-related organizations, stakeholders groups, communities and others to discuss the scope and implementation of new programming launched by DFO to address habitat conservation and stewardship. Over 350 people attended the forum and participated in panel sessions, plenary discussions and working groups.

The forum represents just one of a series of steps in the development of the *A New Direction* program. The information and ideas shared at the forum will provide the basis for further discussion and planning in the months and weeks ahead. Additional area-based forums and/or stakeholder consultations are anticipated in the near future.

Comments on this document or requests for more information should be directed to:

Mark Johnson
Acting Chief, Community Programs
Habitat and Enhancement Branch
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
555 West Hastings St.
Vancouver, B.C.
Tel: 604-666-6831
Fax: 604-666-0292
e-mail: johnsonm@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca

2 FORUM OVERVIEW

2.1 BACKGROUND

A New Direction: Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Forum was a two day event that brought together interested parties to explore key elements of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO's) new approach for protection and stewardship of habitat.

2.1.1 COHO RESPONSE AND FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING PACKAGE

In June 1998, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans announced a major initiative aimed at restoring the health of Canada's Pacific salmon fisheries, particularly coho stocks that were under imminent threat of collapse. The two major components of the initiative were:

- Coho Response – a series of technically-based activities aimed at restoring coho populations through fisheries harvesting restrictions, stock assessment projects and changes in habitat management including improvements to the referrals system, and information collection and management; and,
- Pacific Fisheries Restructuring Program – which included 3 elements:
 - (a) industry restructuring and adjustment (such as fleet buy-backs);
 - (b) economic and social impacts of changes in the fishery on individual fishers; and
 - (c) resource rebuilding.

The Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Forum addressed issues related to this last element of the initiative, Resource Rebuilding (see Box 1). In particular, the workshop explored the scope of responsibilities for the two types of positions likely to be created under the initiative to facilitate conservation and stewardship efforts – Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators.

BOX 1: FOUR KEY COMPONENTS OF RESOURCE REBUILDING

1. Habitat Conservation and Stewardship
 - includes funding for Habitat Auxiliaries, Stewardship Coordinators and promotion for the establishment and management of fisheries habitat planning and management boards, councils, or equivalents at the watershed scale.
2. Habitat Restoration and Salmon Enhancement Package
 - funding for community partnerships on habitat restoration, inventory, some stewardship activities and stock assessment.
3. Strategic Enhancement
 - for strategic interventions for stocks that are imminently threatened with collapse.
4. Long-Term Investment
 - funds invested in a trust to support conservation and stewardship activities over the long-term.

2.1.2 A NEW DIRECTION FOR CANADA'S PACIFIC SALMON FISHERIES

In October 1998, the Department of Fisheries released *A New Direction for Canada's Pacific Salmon Fisheries*, a document outlining 12 broad policy principles that will guide the department's new approach to management of the Pacific salmon fisheries (see Box 2). This document signals several key shifts in approach, including a major emphasis on improved decision-making through structured management and advisory board systems. It envisages that 'regional boards' could "support many activities including but not limited to watershed production, integrated coastal zone planning, fishery enforcement and compliance, and habitat protection, enhancement and restoration."

2.2 FORUM OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Forum (Day 1 only) were to:

- provide an overview of DFO's commitment to a new approach for fisheries habitat planning and management;
- review the current state of fisheries habitat in British Columbia and the Yukon;
- explore models of shared decision-making that expand the role of other levels of government (First Nations, provincial, territorial, local

BOX 2: POLICY PRINCIPLES FOR A NEW APPROACH TO THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC SALMON FISHERIES

Conservation

1. Conservation of Pacific Salmon stocks is the primary objective and will take precedence in managing the resource.
2. A precautionary approach to fisheries management will continue to be adopted.
3. Continue to work towards a net gain in productive capacity for salmon habitat in British Columbia (and the Yukon).
4. An ecological approach will guide fisheries and oceans management in the future.

Sustainable Use

5. The long term productivity of the resource will not be compromised because of short term factors or considerations - tradeoffs between current harvest benefits and long term stock well being will be resolved in favour of the long term.
6. All sectors - First Nations, recreational and commercial - will use selective methods to harvest salmon.
7. First Nations requirements for food, social and ceremonial purposes will continue to have first priority after conservation requirements.
8. Whenever possible, the recreational fishery will be provided with more reliable and stable fishing opportunities.
9. The commercial fishery will be a more diversified (less dependent on salmon) and economically viable sector, better able to withstand fluctuations in the cycle of the resource and the market.

Improved Decision-Making

10. Clear, objective and relevant information on major issues requiring decisions will be provided to the public with sufficient time and opportunity for review, comment and feedback. Periodic review of progress and achievements will be initiated to facilitate accountability for the sound management of the salmon resource and its habitat.
11. Government and stakeholders will together be responsible and accountable for sustainable fisheries.
12. Enhanced community, regional and sector wide input to decision-making will be pursued through a structured management and advisory board system.

government), stakeholders and local communities in planning and management in watersheds in British Columbia, the Yukon, and in other jurisdictions; and

- clarify opportunities for integration of fisheries habitat management with land use, growth management and other planning and decision-making initiatives in British Columbia and the Yukon.

Building on the results of Day 1, the objectives of the second day of the forum were to:

- identify key elements of successful models of integrated joint planning and management for fisheries habitat at a watershed scale; and,
- provide specific recommendations for the further development and implementation of the Habitat Conservation and Stewardship component of Resource Rebuilding, including suggestions for the scope of responsibilities and administrative function of Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators.

2.3 SCOPE OF DISCUSSIONS

The Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Forum provided a critical opportunity for governments, stakeholder groups and communities to come together and contribute their experience and expertise towards a common goal of improved fisheries habitat planning and management. It provided an opportunity for detailed discussions of expanding the role of First Nations, stakeholders and communities in shared decision-making through regional boards or similar bodies. It also provided an opportunity to develop recommendations on how best to deploy and utilize Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators in each area of the Pacific region, and define their role.

It was acknowledged that this event was a first step in a longer process that will unfold over the next few years. Moreover, it is expected that different approaches will need to be developed to match specific circumstances and geographic conditions in different areas of the region – no single model will suit all situations. Other discussions are anticipated in each of the regions of the Province and the territory to gain input on local needs and concerns.

2.4 FORUM STEERING COMMITTEE & CONVENING PARTNERS

The following groups were involved in planning and management for the forum:

- B.C. Aboriginal Fisheries Commission;
- Pacific Salmon Foundation;
- Salmon Enhancement and Habitat Advisory Board; and,
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

2.5 FORUM DISCUSSION FRAMEWORK

<p>The State of Habitat in the Pacific Region</p>	<p>What is the current state of fisheries habitat in British Columbia and the Yukon?</p> <p>What issues require attention? Where should efforts be directed most urgently?</p>
<p><i>A New Direction</i></p>	<p>What is encompassed in DFO's <i>A New Direction</i> initiative?</p>
<p>Cooperative watershed planning and management at the state, provincial and river basin scale</p>	<p>What models of joint planning and management for fisheries habitat have been tried in other jurisdictions?</p> <p>What has been tried here?</p> <p>What are the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches?</p>
<p>Opportunities to participate in existing planning processes to protect and enhance fish habitat</p>	<p>How can improved fisheries habitat planning and protection be achieved through other forms of land use planning, growth management and other planning initiatives in the Pacific region?</p>
<p>B.C. Case studies of cooperative planning and management at the watershed scale</p>	<p>What are the key lessons from experience in watershed level planning and management in B.C.?</p>
<p>Elements of Successful Models of Joint Planning and Management</p>	<p>What are the key elements of successful models of cooperative planning and management?</p>
<p>Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Program Overview</p>	<p>What is the scope and intent of the program?</p> <p>What potential roles can the Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators play?</p>
<p>Working Groups: Implementing <i>A New Direction</i></p>	<p>How do the key elements of cooperative planning and management apply in this context?</p> <p>What specific recommendations can we offer for the development and implementation of the program to build on opportunities and overcome constraints?</p> <p>What should the scope of responsibilities be for Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators?</p>
<p>Summary Comments from Steering Committee; Closing Comments from DFO</p>	<p>Where do we go from here?</p>

2.6 FORUM AGENDA-AT-A-GLANCE

Time	Day One: Friday, January 8, 1999	Day Two: Saturday, January 9, 1999
8:00	Registration, Refreshments & Poster Session	Refreshments & Poster Session
8:30	Welcome, Forum Host Opening Prayer, Musqueam Elder & Welcome from First Nations Facilitator's introduction and overview	Summary Report from Day 1 - Forum Rapporteur Presentation: <i>What Makes a Community Based Stewardship Group Successful?</i> - Greg Mallette, Planner, Habitat and Enhancement Branch
9:00	Presentation: State of Habitat in the Pacific Region - Otto Langer - Land Use Planning Unit, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans Questions and discussion	Presentation: <i>Overview of the Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Program</i> - Mark Johnson, A/Chief, Community Programs & Melody Farrell, Land Use Planning Unit, DFO - Potential roles for the Stewardship Coordinators - Potential roles for the Habitat Auxiliaries Questions and discussion
9:30	Keynote Address - Hon. David Anderson, M.P., Minister, Fisheries and Oceans: <i>A New Direction</i> Questions and discussion	
10:15	Refreshment Break	Refreshment Break
10:35	Plenary: <i>Cooperative Watershed Planning & Management at the Provincial, State and River Basin Scale</i> - Governor's Office, State of Oregon - Ken Bierly, Program Manager, Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board - Governor's Office, State of Washington - Joe Williams, Chief Policy Advisor for Watershed Planning, Dept. of Ecology - Bow River Basin Water Council, Alberta - Menno Homan, Chair - Fraser Basin Council - Hon. Iona Campagnolo, Chair Questions and discussion	Working Groups: <i>Implementing A New Direction</i> - How do the key elements of cooperative planning and management apply in this context? - What specific recommendations can we offer for the development and implementation of the program to build on opportunities and overcome constraints? - What should the scope of responsibilities be for Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators?
12:15	Lunch & poster session	Lunch & poster session
1:15	Plenary: <i>Opportunities to participate in existing planning processes to protect and enhance fish habitat</i> - Provincial Land Use Planning - Yvette Wells, Land Use Coordination Office (LUCO) - Water Use Planning Process (WUP) - Daryl Field, B.C. Hydro - Growth Management Plans/Official Community Plans - E. Karlsen, Ministry of Municipal Affairs - Yukon Salmon Committee - Gerry Couture, Vice-Chair Questions and discussion	Working Groups, continued
2:45	Refreshment Break	2:30 Refreshment Break
3:10	Plenary: <i>B.C. Case studies of cooperative planning and management at the watershed level</i> - Salmon River Watershed Roundtable, Salmon Arm, B.C. - Dorothy Argent, Chair - The Comox Valley Experience: Building Community Self-reliance - Chris Hilliar, DFO - Alouette River Management Society/Ridge Meadows Watershed Council - Tom Cadieux - Nicola Watershed Stewardship and Fisheries Authority & the B.C. First Nations Experience - Arnie Narcisse Questions and discussion	Working Group Reports Plenary Discussion: <i>Key Areas of Agreement, Outstanding Issues</i> Summary Comments: Forum Steering Committee Closing Remarks: <i>Where do we go from here?</i> - Donna Petrachenko, RDG - Ted Perry, Executive Director, Habitat and Enhancement Branch
4:45	Adjourn	Close

3 FORUM RESULTS

The following sections provide brief summaries of results from each session of the forum. For more detailed information, please contact the Vancouver office of the Habitat and Enhancement Branch (see Section 1 for contact information).

3.1 OPENING PRESENTATION: THE STATE OF HABITAT IN THE PACIFIC REGION

OTTO LANGER, CHIEF, LAND USE PLANNING UNIT, DEPT. OF FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Otto introduced his presentation by reviewing the constitutional responsibilities of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to manage fish under the federal Fisheries Act, Oceans Act and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. Otto reviewed DFO's Fish Habitat Policy to achieve a net gain in the productive capacity of natural fish habitats through the three departmental goals of conservation ("no net loss") and restoration and development ("net gain"). Otto also highlighted the findings of the 1997 Auditor General Report, *Pacific Salmon: Sustainability of the Resource Base*, which concluded that the ability of the agency to sustain fisheries was questionable and that new measures were needed to protect the resource. These measures include improved integrated resource management, new management guidelines, increased monitoring and enforcement, increased information collection, and increased coordination with other governments and the public. A report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts was (May 1998) was also cited as re-affirming the Auditor General's recommendations.

For the remainder of his presentation, Otto gave an overview of the status of fisheries in each of the 12 habitat status areas in the Pacific Region. Otto reported that:

- Significant habitat loss has occurred in four of the twelve areas (Lower Fraser, East Coast Vancouver Island and Sunshine Coast, Fraser/Thompson/Nicola, and Eastern BC).
- Habitat is in moderate to good condition in five habitat status areas (Upper Fraser River/Cariboo/Chilcotin, Central Coast, North Coast/Skeena/Nass, Queen Charlottes, and West Coast Vancouver Island).
- Habitat is in good condition with relatively low human impacts in two areas (Transboundary Rivers area (Northwest BC) and the Yukon).

Otto reported that there are significant on-going threats to fish habitats in many regions due to a range of factors including: logging and pulp mills, mining and smelting, hydro dams, agriculture, oil and gas exploration, new highways, aquaculture and urban development. He also cited positive

examples of habitat conservation and restoration work in each of these regions. Otto also reported that the oceans, which are normally thought to be a stable physical habitat, are of growing concern due to global atmospheric change which is affecting ocean temperatures and fish survival. Aquaculture and on-going foreshore encroachments are also a threat.

Otto concluded that we are not achieving 'no net loss' but rather "slow net loss." The work of habitat conservation and restoration has become very complex and the pressures on habitat are increasing. New and better tools are needed to promote stewardship to new levels and foster a conservation ethic that will change attitudes and behaviour and arrest the loss of fish and fish habitat. Otto concluded that more empowerment of communities is needed and that "partnerships are the future". In his experience, there "has never been more interest in protecting streams than we have now... together we can do a better job."

3.2 KEYNOTE PRESENTATION: A NEW DIRECTION

**DONNA PETRACHENKO, REGIONAL DIRECTOR GENERAL, PACIFIC REGION,
& HON. DAVID ANDERSON, MINISTER OF FISHERIES AND OCEANS**

In introducing a video presentation by the Minister, Donna made the following points:

- We need a new conservation ethic – we have to “think of ourselves as trustees that leave the trust in better shape than we received it”- then we know we are responsible stewards.
- DFO knows it needs to learn from the way we have done business in the past – *A New Direction* enables this new approach.
- In the past few months, we have made some significant improvements, such as the establishment of the Pacific Fisheries Resource Conservation Council.
- We have a general framework for the program, but we are looking to you for input on specific needs.

The following is the text of the Minister's speech:

I'm happy to see so many of you willing to explore a subject near to my heart: fish habitat. Specifically, how we can effectively protect and care for the streams and rivers that flow through our neighbourhoods and that drain the watersheds in which we live, work and play. We all in this room recognize that healthy streams and rivers are crucial for the survival and sustainability of our precious salmon stocks. Our struggling coho salmon – which spend a year or more of their young lives in small creeks – are particularly vulnerable to habitat change.

Over my lifetime, I have seen the impacts of our industrialized society on salmon habitat. I've witnessed many streams from my boyhood on Vancouver

Island fall victim to culverts, land filling, neglect and ignorance. My early years fishing with my grandfather taught me to love these streams and I feel their loss deeply. As Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, I am committed to stop this loss. But I need your help.

This forum is an exciting opportunity for us to find ways of working together to more effectively conserve fish and fish habitat. Over the next two days, community and environmental groups, governments, First Nations and interested individuals will share experiences and expertise. We are asking for your input on a new element of our habitat program. The recommendations you provide will help determine how we put into action our new direction. I thank each of you in advance for your contribution.

I wish also to thank the partners who helped Fisheries and Oceans Canada make this event possible: Rich Chapple of the Pacific Salmon Foundation, Tom Cadieux of the Salmon Enhancement and Habitat Advisory Board, and Fred Fortier and Beryl Guerin of the B.C. Aboriginal Fisheries Commission. Your work and insights on the steering committee were invaluable.

Fish habitat is under tremendous pressure and the challenge to protect it is becoming increasingly complex. Over the years, my staff has done good work. But burgeoning population growth, land development and resource exploitation are making it difficult to achieve no net loss of fish habitat. Today's reality calls for new ways of doing business.

That is why I have committed \$100 million over five years to Resource Rebuilding, a program to strengthen DFO's action on salmon habitat and stock enhancement. I announced this as part of the \$400 million program to restructure the salmon fishery on the West Coast. The West Coast fishery is undergoing major changes and it is clear that the status quo is no longer acceptable. Through this restructuring program, we are trying new approaches to deal with old problems.

This shift has already begun. Selective fisheries have been testing methods to harvest abundant stocks and release threatened ones. Industry diversification and the second round of voluntary salmon license retirement are underway. The long-standing allocation conflicts that have hampered effective salmon management are being addressed.

As well, the Pacific Fisheries Resource Conservation Council has begun its work. The council is an independent body of respected individuals and chaired by the Honourable John Fraser. Its job is to advise the public and governments on salmon and habitat conservation.

New approaches for habitat are being delivered through the \$100 million Resource Rebuilding package. It is designed to use new mechanisms for the long-term protection of habitat and stewardship of watersheds. We cannot do this alone. We need the help of local communities and interest groups as advocates for fish and habitat and as stronger voices in shared decision-making.

The Resource Rebuilding program plans to deploy habitat auxiliaries and stewardship coordinators across the Pacific Region to support local communities. They will work closely with First Nations, developers, industry, farmers and government agencies. These new positions will help these groups to prevent damage to habitat, promote sustainable use of land and water resources and participate in land and water use planning.

Successful, long-term habitat protection requires us to effectively plan and manage the way we use water and land in our watersheds. This means balancing the needs of fish with the needs of other users. Land and water use planning can benefit from local communities, stewardship groups and others who care about fish and habitat working together and providing input to watershed councils, roundtables and other decision-making bodies. Habitat auxiliaries and stewardship coordinators can help make this happen. These groups can also make valuable contributions to developing fish production plans and local watershed management plans.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada has for several years supported fledgling watershed councils and community roundtables. These groups include the Alouette River Management Society in Maple Ridge, the Salmon River Watershed Roundtable in Salmon Arm and the Langley Environmental Partners. The Department provided them with technical and financial assistance through the Fraser River Action Plan. We have witnessed their successes in restoring habitat, raising public awareness, advocating for fish and dealing with watershed management issues. And we are aware of their power and their potential.

Another aspect of the Resource Rebuilding program is making additional funding available for conservation projects through community partnerships through the Habitat Restoration and Salmon Enhancement Program. Strategic stock enhancement will also be part of the program.

All of these programs are driven by a policy called *A New Direction for Canada's Pacific Salmon Fisheries*, which I released this fall. This summarizes our vision for the future – one that calls for fundamental change to conservation-based management of fisheries and habitat. Resource Rebuilding is a key part of that new direction.

This new direction emphasizes public involvement. Many communities are already actively involved in habitat restoration and watershed stewardship. We acknowledge the potential for local groups to assume a greater role. Partnerships are not, as some have suggested, a way for the federal government to shrink from its responsibility for conservation. Partnerships are about joining forces, improving effectiveness, drawing upon local knowledge and addressing local concerns. We value partnerships because they help foster awareness and a strong stewardship ethic – necessary for long-term conservation.

In my visits across this region, it is our partnerships that give me the greatest hope for the future of our salmon and their habitat. I have visited many of the 10,000 volunteers who are working with Fisheries and Oceans staff to enhance salmon stocks and habitat on their local streams. I have met dedicated Streamkeepers who are improving the health of their watersheds. My staff and I value these relationships.

In this forum, you'll be talking a lot about stewardship. I'd like to wrap up with a definition that I hope will inspire us in the job ahead. Stewardship refers to the cooperative planning and management of environmental resources, where all users and managers share the responsibility for conservation. Stewardship embodies a new ethic of caring for local ecosystems in the interest of long-term sustainability.

We have a chance here to strengthen our partnerships and forge new ones. We also have a chance to cement our commitment to stewardship so we can share the responsibility and benefits of our magnificent salmon resource – not only with each other, but with our children and our children's children.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

In the question period that follows, the following issues were raised:

- A question was raised regarding the apparent lack of attention to marine habitat, particularly given concerns over salmon aquaculture, and the impacts of marine trawling. Donna responded by highlighting that the Oceans Act is being implemented, that calls for additional work focusing in marine environmental quality, and noting that work on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) is on-going. She also noted that DFO is “looking at partnerships on the science side” and is considering initiating a study on trawl fishing impacts.
- One individual commented on an apparent lack of linkage between HRDC and DFO programs, and pointed out that experience at the local level suggests that HRDC funding is not available to assist with projects to be initiated under Resource Rebuilding. The RDG agreed to look into this problem, and offered an assurance that this is not a question of inconsistent policy at senior levels but likely a problem of interpretation of policy at the local level.
- Several additional comments were offered regarding effective enforcement, specifically in terms of catch monitoring and local pollution offences.

In closing, Donna noted that efforts are underway to build the skills set for DFO staff who will be asked to undertake a more facilitative role; this training may include such things as dispute resolution.

3.3 PANEL: COOPERATIVE WATERSHED PLANNING & MANAGEMENT AT THE PROVINCIAL, STATE AND RIVER BASIN SCALE

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, STATE OF OREGON – KEN BIERLY, PROGRAM MANAGER, GOVERNOR'S WATERSHED ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Ken provided an overview of Oregon's experience with Watershed Councils, an initiative that attempts to "move beyond regulatory regimes to manage whole watersheds, involving inter-agency cooperation, demonstration projects and educational efforts." Currently, over 90 such Watershed Councils have been identified. He cited some of the key principles that guide this work:

- Recognition of the need to engage local citizens.
- Recognition of the need to maintain voluntary involvement.
- A need to base management on the best science available.
- Monitoring and evaluation as a critical tool to measure progress or failure.

Ken summarized some of the tools developed through the program, such as a Watershed Assessment manuals, handbooks, coordinated approaches to funding, a streamlined regulatory process, and use of GIS. He also highlighted 7 keys to success:

- Make councils spatially explicit at the local level.
- Ensure representation of all interests.
- Secure individuals with commitment.
- Make sure there are regulations to back-up voluntary stewardship.
- Acknowledge the time it takes to do this work well.
- Aim for focused opportunities rather than broad responsibilities.
- Expect that some local disputes will occur.

Ken also pointed out that government has a critical role to play in providing technical assistance, defining clearly the role of Councils, and creating an overarching context within which local efforts can be better understood and valued. He also pointed out some sure ways to such initiatives fail:

- Deluge councils with paperwork.
- Turn them into an arm of government.
- Give them regulatory authority.
- Second guess their decisions.
- Make the process as complex as possible.
- Be unclear or change the expected outcomes.
- Promise big outcomes for little effort.

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, STATE OF WASHINGTON – JOE WILLIAMS, CHIEF POLICY ADVISOR FOR WATERSHED PLANNING, DEPT. OF ECOLOGY

Joe provided an overview of Washington State's recently passed Watershed Planning Act, which he described as an "aggressive agenda to address water needs of folks, farms and fish." He pointed out that this Act represents a paradigm shift-developing a cooperative method to determine current water resource situation in watersheds and provide opportunities for citizen input. The key state interests in such a process are:

- Water for fish restoration/natural resources.
- Water for responsibly planned growth.
- Efficient use of water through conservation and re-use.

Joe outlined the planning process, which is undertaken in each county within the Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA) and that is initiated only if the counties, the largest town and the utility all agree; Tribes with reservation lands within the WRIA are also invited to participate. The state then provides funding for watershed assessments and for the planning process, including up to \$50,000 for Phase 1 (organizing), up to \$200,000 for watershed assessments in Phase 2, and up to \$250,000 for plan development in the final Phase.

Joe noted that 19 such Watershed Plans have been developed so far covering half the state. He also emphasized that state agencies participate fully in the process – "with state agencies working together to present one voice" – and are obligated to change policies, rules and funding if consensus is reached. Joe also stressed that the process is intended to be open, with representation encouraged from "a wide range of water resource interests."

In closing, Joe identified some of the key challenges of this approach to planning:

- Tribal participation: All tribes with fishing rights should be invited and Tribal concurrence is needed for establishing in-stream flows.
- Achieving agreement on definitions of "consensus," "governments" (cities, counties, state and tribes), and "a wide range of water resource interests" has been problematic.
- Implementation: Fully fund all WRIsAs at \$500,000 each.

BOW RIVER BASIN WATER COUNCIL, ALBERTA – MENNO HOMAN, CHAIR

Menno provided an overview of the Bow River Basin Water Council's approach to cooperative planning – in an area that includes 36% of Alberta's population and which is experiencing economic and population growth that has escalated to "Tsunami proportions":

- Members of the Council are stakeholders in partnership with government,

including municipalities, cities, recreationalists, irrigation districts, NGOs, commercial users and regulators.

- The basin is managed on a reach-by-reach basis, with particular attention paid to the headwaters from which 80% of the water flow is provided by snowmelt.
- Major water use includes municipal supply, waste water assimilation, and irrigation (which uses 48% of the available supply.)
- Many solutions to long term problems – such as: sharing of supply, basin wide planning, water issues management (e.g., phosphorous in sediments), water quality assessments – require a team approach as all interested parties will ultimately benefit from successful management of the resource. All stakeholders must demonstrate that they acknowledge “ownership” of issues and sign on to a shared charter.
- Government has had to realign its conventional approach in the face of reduced funding and a new, de-regulated environment, and engage in partnerships to maintain and enhance effective management.
- The Council “has a huge resource base, with manpower, technical expertise, machinery and cash,” and spends over \$200,000 annually on water management and structures in the Bow Basin. It reports to the Alberta Minister of Environmental Protection. Core funding is provided by the province but substantial time and money is donated by stakeholders. The Bow River Water Quality Foundation is the Council’s fundraiser and banker.
- Members do not give away their legal rights to join the Council, nor does the regulator fetter their future decision-making ability. But experience shows that working together through the Council is key – no-one can act in isolation in a large basin.

Based on the experience in the Bow Basin, Menno offered the following recommendations to DFO:

- Provide core administrative funding assistance and technical support to community led watershed councils.
- Act passionately and openly in the best interests of the watershed.
- Encourage awareness and debate among watershed stakeholders toward all individuals’ enjoyment of water and water necessary to nurture the environment.
- Adopt a holistic land and water use management approach.

FRASER BASIN COUNCIL – HON. IONA CAMPAGNOLO, CHAIR

Iona noted that the Fraser Basin Council is pleased to participate in this forum “because it believes that the development of these positions [HA’s and SC’s] represents movement toward building new models of how governance is

undertaken between DFO and other interests.” The key message, Iona continued, is that “solutions to issues such as ensuring the sustainability of fish habitat are far more complex than once imagined... and developing solutions requires time and ongoing dialogue among all interests – even when it is uncomfortable to do so.”

She continued by outlining structure of the Fraser Basin Council, and its “facilitative role,” through which it provides a “safe place for dialogue,” assists with the resolution of conflicts, unravels jurisdictional issues, and facilitates improved understanding of the need for balance between the social, environmental and economic components of sustainability. She stressed the critical role played by the community-based, Regional Coordinators.

Iona outlined a number of specific areas of work undertaken by the Council in recent years, including:

- Facilitation of a workshop to solicit input from a broad range of stakeholders on the Streamside Directives under the BC Fish Protection Act.
- Bringing together key interests to address concerns over the management of the Agassiz Debris Trap in the Fraser River.
- Facilitating the development of a solution to address the acid mine drainage problem from the Old Britannia Mines site near Squamish.
- Assisting in the development of the Nechako Watershed Council and helping to work towards solutions to the long standing disputes in this watershed.

She stressed that solutions are not simple, quick, or easily described in terms of a template – each situation is different and requires a unique approach. “Success means that there are no exultant winners, no crestfallen losers, but rather solutions with which we can all live,” she said. She also pointed out that the Council is not designed to remain actively involved in these processes on an on-going basis, noting that “even if resources did not prohibit us from doing so, we would leave effective partnerships to stand alone, because successful partnerships should not need on-going facilitation!”

Iona also addressed the nature of governments’ involvement in partnerships. “It is very difficult for Governments to accept that in spite of their continuing powers of legislation, regulation and enforcement, when they make partnerships with the community, they are no longer empowered to act in isolation...” she said, as “no-one is first among equals in such partnerships... partnerships simply requires equality!” She also noted that the title of Habitat Auxiliaries might need to be rethought as it connotes ‘functioning in a subsidiary capacity’ and therefore “has a place in old models of thinking.”

She closed with the observation that “Governments are now part of the rowing team on the ship of state, and by involving the community as a partner, the job of Captain – that is determining in which direction the ship

will sail – becomes one of shared responsibility and accountability... The rules for few people on a huge planet no longer work for vast numbers of people in a tiny planet!”

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

In the question period following the panel presentations, the following points were raised:

- If the allocation of water licenses establishes a property right – apparently in perpetuity – how can water management issues be addressed successfully? Panelists noted that approaches to this problem being tried in various jurisdictions include possible purchase of water rights, utilizing endangered species legislation, and using growth management (urban containment) as a tool to manage population growth and water demands.
- Concern was raised over the management of groundwater, and the lack of regulations in BC. Panelists commented that following the completion of studies that have demonstrated the linkage between groundwater and surface hydrology, some basins have been closed to further withdrawals from groundwater in Oregon. BC is also the last jurisdiction in North America without groundwater legislation, and nutrient loading – largely from agricultural activity – is a key issue in the lower Fraser valley.

3.4 PANEL: OPPORTUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE IN EXISTING PLANNING PROCESSES TO PROTECT AND ENHANCE FISH HABITAT

PROVINCIAL LAND USE PLANNING – YVETTE WELLS, LAND USE COORDINATION OFFICE (LUCO)

Yvette began by outlining provincial initiatives related to resource management:

- *Forest Renewal BC*: a provincially owned crown corporation, established by statute in 1994, to protect and enhance environmental and other values in BC’s forests, create more value and jobs from the timber harvested, provide training for forest workers and strengthen communities. FRBC runs several programs relevant to habitat protection, including:
 - The Watershed Restoration Program was initiated in 1994/1995 to accelerate the recovery of watersheds adversely impacted by past forest harvesting practices or natural causes. Activities funded under the program include assessments and detailed restoration prescriptions, road deactivation and rehabilitation, bridge repair, and rehabilitation of slopes, gullies, streams and riparian zones with the goal of restoring natural ecosystem productivity for fisheries and other natural resources.

- The Operational Inventory Program was initiated in 1995/1996 to develop new inventories and to accelerate the development of existing inventories critical to forest development planning and Forest Practices Code implementation. Information gathering involves acquiring inventory data for a variety of natural resources including among other things, fish and fish habitat, terrain stability, water quality and quantity, and traditional use by First Nations.
- The Fisheries Biodiversity Research Program is focused on riparian research, habitat requirements for sensitive species and new methods for watershed restoration, habitat inventory and stock assessment.
- *Fisheries Renewal BC*: a provincial Crown corporation created in 1997 under the Fisheries Renewal Act to lead the renewal of British Columbia's fish resource. The corporation works with partners to make strategic investments in programs that improve fish stocks and habitat; develop new fisheries; diversify and market products and services; create jobs; and strengthen fishing communities through training, education and technological development. The mandate extends to all fish (finfish and shellfish, crustaceans, aquatic animals and aquatic plants) all waters (fresh and marine) and all sectors (commercial, Aboriginal and recreational). Funding is available for works on all lands (public, private and First Nations). Fisheries Renewal has three main programs: Salmonid Renewal; Planning and Partnership; and Development and Diversification.
- Fish Protection Act was approved in the 1997 sitting of the legislature. The Act provides powers to ensure water for fish, protect and restore fish habitat, and strengthen riparian protection and local government planning
- *Urban Salmon Habitat Program* was initiated in 1995 as a component of the BC Salmon Habitat Conservation Plan and is focused on protecting and restoring salmonid fish habitat in the urban areas of the Georgia Basin. The program supports habitat and stewardship coordinators in provincial fisheries regional offices, and provides direct funding to community based stewardship groups and local governments.
- *Habitat Conservation Trust Fund* is funded from surcharges on angling, hunting, trapping and guiding licenses and is used to support specific projects to conserve and enhance fish, wildlife and their habitat.
- *Water Use Planning* (WUP) process was initiated in 1996 to review and clarify the rights to provincial water associated with the operation of hydroelectric and other water control facilities. The goal of the WUP process will be to achieve consensus on a set of operating rules for each facility to satisfy the full range of water use interests with a particular emphasis on improving operational regimes to the benefit of fish. In the first five years of the process, all of BC Hydro's facilities will be reviewed and Water Use Plans will be developed.

- *Systems Operation Fund* allows for the implementation of the water use plans developed for each BC Hydro facility. Interim funding targets have been established which will rise over time as the various plans are developed and implemented.
- *Corporate Resource Inventory Initiative (CRII)* funds are used to provide information on fish, fish habitat and fishing to sub-regional land use planning.
- *Common Land Information Base (CLIB)* supports fisheries inventory. CLIB funds are used to provide fisheries information to pre-treaty and treaty negotiations with First Nations.
- *Forest Practices Code*.
- *Protected Areas Strategy*.
- *Land and Resource Management Planning (LRMPs)*.

Yvette outlined that LRMPs are undertaken to:

- put sustainability principles into action;
- provide opportunity to reconcile and balance policy goals and objectives with local demands;
- address adverse effects of past resource development activities;
- end disruptive community conflicts;
- make more efficient use of scarce land and resources;
- allow for opportunities to identify innovative practices;
- provide certainty;
- level the playing field;
- provide a framework for operational planning and decision-making; and,
- improve the long-term efficiency of administration.

LRMP are designed to:

- be developed within the confines of provincial policy and legislation;
- provide direction and context to local planning initiatives;
- embrace principles of integrated resource management and sustainable development;
- be developed with public participation;
- encourage First Nations' participation;
- be prepared within the constraints of available information, funding and participants' time;
- be prepared for all Crown lands; and,
- be implemented by the Inter-Agency Management Committees.

She explained that “generally, land use plans provide an overall framework for land use, conservation and economic development.” All parties with key interests or stake in the plan area are invited and encouraged to participate. More specifically, land use plans produce the following components:

- Land allocation in the form of resource management zones (Park and Protected Area, Sensitive Resource Management Zone, General Resource Management Zone, Intensive Resource Management Zone, Settlement Zone, Agricultural Zone).
- Land and resource objectives and strategies.
- Socio-economic transition measures.
- Implementation and monitoring provisions.

In closing, Yvette offered the following tips for successful participation in multi-stakeholder planning processes:

- Get it together!
- Do your homework – find out what is going on in your area, research the your areas of interest.
- Meet with other interest groups, stakeholders, officials, etc.
- Identify your most important issues and then prioritize them.
- Develop a healthy respect for all participants in the process.
- Be realistic.

She also stressed that Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators should stay in touch with their provincial counterparts and build on existing information – “not reinvent the wheel!”

WATER USE PLANNING PROCESS (WUP) – DARYL FIELD, B.C. HYDRO & KEVIN CONLIN, BC FISHERIES

Daryl began by explaining that water use planning is a provincial program, and noted that water use plans (WUPs) set out how water is to be managed by defining ‘operating parameters’ to balance environmental, social and economic interests. A WUP is specific to a water control facility and is attached to a water license. She noted that BC Hydro will be preparing a water use plan for each of its facilities. The product of the process goes forward as a recommendation and is subject to the regulatory review process. The various steps in the process are as follows:

- Step 1 Initiation and announcement
- Steps 2-9 Plan development (leading to a “draft plan”)
- Step 10 Provincial review and decision (leading to an “authorized plan”)
- Step 11 Federal review (leading to plan implementation)

Step 12 Monitoring and compliance assessment

Step 13 Periodic plan review

Daryl explained that the consultative process:

- is open to broad participation;
- emphasizes the role of information;
- strives for consensus; and
- is flexible.

Kevin then noted that WUPs are considered by the province as a key tool to address fisheries related issues in watersheds with hydro facilities, and outlined the plan development process (Steps 2-9) in greater detail:

- Step 2 involves scoping, which includes meetings held by the licensee and government with key interest groups, to consider various issues including in-stream flow.
- Step 3 involves determination of the consultative process.
- Step 4 defines water use issues and specific objectives (to attain a type and quantity of fish habitat) – with stakeholder involvement.
- Step 5 involves gathering additional information on water use impacts (such as threshold studies of in-stream flows), and identifying data gaps.
- Step 6 involves creating operating alternatives.
- Step 7 is an assessment of tradeoffs between alternatives.
- Step 8 involves a determination and documentation of areas of consensus and disagreement and generating a Consultation Report.
- Step 9 involves the preparation of the draft WUP which is forwarded to the Water Comptroller.

Daryl and Kevin closed by outlining some of the key challenges experienced during the 2 pilot processes:

- Ensuring inclusiveness, given that some processes are complex and will continue for several months.
- Providing adequate resources to support the planning process.
- Providing appropriate types and amounts of information to support planning, and addressing uncertainties.
- Maintaining an overall provincial perspective on water use, given that the facilities are linked and how one is operated affects all others.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANS / OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLANS – E. KARLSEN, MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Erik began by outlining the growth management elements of BC Fisheries Strategy:

- Introduction of the Fish Protection Act to protect fish and fish habitat, and ensure water for fish.
- Recent changes to the Municipal Act to strengthen local government powers to protect fish habitat.
- Establishment of the Urban Salmon Habitat Program to support community groups and local governments.

He then provided an introduction to local government in British Columbia – an “independent, responsible and accountable order of government” whose purposes include:

- providing good government for community;
- providing works, services and facilities;
- providing stewardship of public assets; and
- fostering the current and future economic, social and environment well-being of its community .

Erik stressed that local governments have the power to plan, regulate, make requirements and approve the use, development and servicing of private land and the private use of Crown land. In BC there are various forms of local government:

- 151 Municipalities;
- 151 mayors and 813 councillors (total 964);
- 27 Regional Districts;
- 181 electoral area directors plus municipal directors; and,
- 1 Islands Trust with 13 local trust areas and 26 local trustees.

The total revenues of local governments in 1996 is in the order of \$4 billion, with \$1.8 billion from property taxes. Total expenditures in 1996 are in the order of \$3.8 billion.

Erik then went on to discuss development and impacts on local ecosystems. “Basically,” he said, “we cut and clear, pave and pipe, and ditch and drain!” Development therefore affects habitat in 3 ways:

- water volume and flow;
- streamside vegetation; and,
- water quality.

He explained that we therefore need to:

- address hydrological impacts;
- protect riparian areas; and,
- manage non-point source pollution.

“Local government can address fish habitat in all ways necessary to sustain ecosystem structure and function,” he said. “However, local government powers are discretionary, enabling and limiting” he pointed out, and thus it is not possible to prescribe the exact use to which the land is put within a particular designation under zonation. Erik summarized the powers of local governments, as follows:

- regional growth strategies and implementation agreements;
- liquid waste management plans, which can be used to address issues such as stormwater management;
- official community plans, which are the primary planning document – “If fish protection provisions are not contained in the OCP, it is not possible to address these concerns later – development cannot be contrary to the OCP!”;
- regulations (zoning, etc); and,
- development approvals.

Erik stressed that addressing habitat concerns necessarily involves grappling with multiple interests (governments, groups, developers, land owners, and individuals) and outlined various crucial considerations for habitat planning at the local level, including:

- relevant policy references (e.g., S 12 of the B.C. Fish Protection Act, Canada Fisheries Act);
- environmental, social and economic considerations;
- land use and development considerations;
- regional and community visions, goals, objectives, policies and programs;
- land use designations and policies;
- development approval guidelines and requirements;
- regulations;
- development approvals;
- compliance monitoring; and
- enforcement.

Finally, Erik offered some suggestions for getting involved in habitat planning at the local level:

- Get to know your local government (elected officials and staff).
- Learn about their interests and priorities and tell them about yours.
- Get to know the contents of plans, regulations – are they considering fish habitat – and if not, why not?
- Work in collaboration – local governments have to address multiple interests and work within the bounds of legislation and common law.
- Get involved in committee work.
- Ensure that habitat work is known to local governments and supported by local government decisions

YUKON SALMON COMMITTEE – GERRY COUTURE, VICE-CHAIR

Gerry outlined the new fish and wildlife management processes for the Yukon that have been established since the implementation of the Umbrella Final Agreement (1994):

- Chapter 16 of the Agreement sets up the Fish and Wildlife Management Board (with a Salmon Sub-Committee) and a network of Renewable Resource Councils that come into being as each First Nations' Final Agreement is implemented. The Board is a centralized body that coordinates a system of community-based management and planning based on traditional First Nations Territories. Ultimately, there could be as many as 14 Councils although only seven have been formed to date, and three of these have been established only recently.
- Councils are mandated to make formal recommendations on any matter related to the management of fish, wildlife and their habitat to the Sub-Committee, the Board, First Nations Governments, or the Governments of Canada or Yukon.
- Because the Councils incorporate extensive community consultation in their processes, “they are obvious bodies to become intimately involved in planning and programs for salmon habitat protection and enhancement.” They work closely with First Nations Governments who have land management authority on settlement lands and harvest management authority for First Nations subsistence hunting and fishing.
- The Salmon Sub-Committee is made up of representatives from each major drainage basin and works at the Territorial level. A major portion of its work to date has been involved with gathering habitat information and working to rationalize regulatory processes for industrial development. It has also developed a long-range-early-warning system to identify developments that may have detrimental impacts on salmon.

“The structures for local participation in habitat management and enhancement are already in place in the Yukon!” Gerry said.

Gerry went on to identify a number of key issues:

- Councils have limited technical expertise and not enough funding to hire it, given the wide range of issues they cover. The Territorial Department of Renewable Resources is now providing community-based biologists to work closely with each Council and provide some of the necessary technical expertise. “This has worked well,” Gerry pointed out, “and it provides a model for both Stewardship Coordinators and Habitat Auxiliaries.”
- Experience to date suggests that Councils have struggled until they could find a individual who could play the role of a “sparkplug” in the community-gathering information, coordinating activities, getting programs going, and maintaining community interest. Gerry stressed that “finding this individual is key.”
- It has also been a challenge to coordinate the processes already in place for regulating development with those designed to manage salmon habitat, particularly when the fundamental goals of these processes are different.
- To date, there has been little success drawing development interests – such as placer mining companies – into habitat planning, partly because they see little benefit to be gained from getting involved. “The challenge,” Gerry pointed out, “is getting these interests involved and making them see that there is a benefit to doing so... through incentives.” One example under consideration is the establishment of a cooperative bonding structure to ensure that security bonds for environmental damage are made affordable for those participating in the habitat planning process.

Gerry closed by stressing that “programs to protect or enhance habitat based in the communities should provide real jobs with real benefits for local people!” These programs or projects have to compete in the job market along with other jobs or opportunities.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

The following points were raised in the question period following the panel:

- Some local community efforts are undermined by the election of a pro-development local Council. Discretionary powers for local government can mean a frustrating end to many weeks or years of volunteer stewardship!
- Concerns were raised that the Mining Rights Amendment Act may negate all the consensus reached by LRMP planning tables. Yvette Wells pointed out that the Act only permits mining development in Special Management Zones subject to an environmental assessment.

- The likelihood of regional growth strategies providing sufficient protection for fish habitat protection in the Lower Mainland was discussed. Erik pointed out that the Municipal Act enables local governments to work with everyone to identify where development can and cannot occur. Information is critical to these decisions. Furthermore, the GVRD has urban containment as a major goal, and while we are all on a learning curve, we do have the legal tools and technical capability to address hydrological impacts.
- First Nations involvement in LRMPs was acknowledged to be a challenge. Yvette commented that when the process was designed, it did not provide for proper consultation with First Nations which has led to systematic problems. In more recent processes however, she noted that First Nations perspectives – in terms of a government-to-government relationship – have been better addressed.

3.5 PANEL: CASE STUDIES OF COOPERATIVE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT AT THE WATERSHED LEVEL

SALMON RIVER WATERSHED ROUNDTABLE, SALMON ARM, B.C. – DOROTHY ARGENT, CHAIR

Dorothy Argent recounted some of the experience of the Salmon River Roundtable, located in South central BC. The watershed encompasses the community of Salmon Arm itself, the territories of 5 First Nations Bands, and several local governments and also supports one of the largest sockeye runs in the region. The Roundtable was established in 1991 by community members who shared a concern for the failing health of the river. Since its formation, it has grown to include a broad range of interests and government representatives.

Reflecting on the experience of the last 8 years, Dorothy stressed the importance of a clear and shared vision to galvanize interest and provide a focus for on-going efforts. She also outlined a two-pronged approach to maintain momentum as such initiatives build; one that lets the hands-on people get on with the practical tasks while those that are more planning oriented are working at the process.

“Right from the beginning,” she continued, “we got involved in restoration activities. Since then we have completed over 50 projects on 30 properties with over 40 property owners on the waiting list.” Each project becomes a demonstration site, she noted, providing educational and promotional opportunities. She also noted that one of the most successful approaches has been to link peers with peers, engage in short term (1 year) action plans that show tangible results, and that one of the fastest ways to kill interest is to “build big plans that are removed from day-to-day things happening in the watershed.”

Dorothy also summarized some of the key elements of success:

- Highlighting where people are wrong doesn't help – focus on building agreement instead.
- Create a meeting ground for shared decision-making.
- Make the planning process inclusive.
- Make the basic planning unit the watershed.
- Adopt an ecosystem management approach.
- Work with community champions – find them and enlist them.
- Work towards a common vision.

In closing, Dorothy stressed that the “principle function of DFO is to be a facilitator of change.” She noted that the BC Watershed Stewardship Alliance is helping to raise the credibility of watershed groups in all areas of the province, but cautioned that shifting from consultation to partnerships is not a small step, and is one that should be taken with care.

THE COMOX VALLEY EXPERIENCE: BUILDING COMMUNITY SELF-RELIANCE – CHRIS HILLIAR, DFO

Chris Hilliar and Laurie Dawson provided an introduction to some of the work underway in the Comox Valley on the East Coast of Vancouver Island.

Chris stressed that the degree to which the citizenry is actively involved is critical to community stewardship and went on to describe the dozen or more stewardship groups that are currently active in the Comox Valley. He also noted the importance of clear geographical boundaries to provide clarity and focus to stewardship efforts. “Successful processes need to bring people together from both rural and urban communities,” he said, “and it is the coming together of these people that provides the creativity.”

Chris went on to describe the ‘3 C’s’ of successful community processes:

- communication;
- cooperation; and,
- conflict resolution.

Laurie gave examples of the work of Project Watershed, which was formed in 1993 out of a concern for salmon habitat and water quality. She went on to highlight some of their key programs, including:

- Watershed inventory work: a project to supplement the current Watershed Atlas which is believed to miss many streams in the watershed. An Advisory group establishes priorities for field surveys and then the property owners are contacted for permission to undertake the mapping or ground-truthing. Many streams have already been mapped successfully.

- Securing covenants, noting that sometimes these opportunities come as spin-offs after other cooperative work has been undertaken and relationships with property owners have developed.
- Streamkeepers: supporting work of local groups.
- Baynes Sound stewardship: a project, triggered by shellfish closures, that addresses water quality issues (mostly related to fecal coliforms). This project focuses on low-tech solutions to address hot spots, such as storm drains and septic systems, under the direction of a multi-stakeholder advisory group. The project has led to storm drain repairs, improvements to septic fields for individual dwellings, and the construction of streamside fencing and tree planting to restore riparian habitat.

Laurie concluded by emphasizing the importance of people, and argued that empowerment is at least as important as the actual on-the-ground results of stewardship projects.

ALOUETTE RIVER MANAGEMENT SOCIETY/RIDGE MEADOWS WATERSHED COUNCIL – TOM CADIEUX

Tom opened his slide-based presentation by commenting on the history of the Alouette River, noting that the First Nation’s traditional name for the river – Sanasathyl – means ‘where the people go to fish.’ He illustrated the history of logging in the area, beginning at the turn of the century, and the diversion of water by the BC Electric Company in 1925. “By the 1970’s, the river had been reduced to a trickle and the historic fish runs were all but dying off.”

Tom explained that recent stewardship work built upon years of efforts by local residents and people concerned about the river. The current phase of activity, however, began in 1993 with a community meeting that drew together many individuals who shared a concern for the river. Out of this meeting came a task force and ultimately the Alouette River Management Society (ARMS), which has received funding from a variety of sources including the Fraser Basin Council.

Over recent years, Tom explained, ARMS has engaged in a number of habitat enhancement and restoration initiatives, the most significant of which has been the re-establishment of water levels in the river – a 5 fold increase in flow. “Since then there have been other successes running along side the river,” Tom continued, “as it is self-healing.” Most recently, ARMS is nearing the completion of a new building, the ‘Rivers Heritage Centre’ that will provide a focus for meetings, and streamkeepers training.

In reflecting on the experience of ARMS’s work, Tom offered the following key lessons:

- Integrity: Tom pointed out that one of DFO’s Stewardship Series Publications, *Community Stewardship* emphasized the importance of trust. He also quoted from *Building Sacred Cows Make the Best Burgers: New*

Approaches for Managing Change, noting that ‘Lies have long lives. Trust is delicate. It takes a long time to establish and a split second to lose.’”

- Recruitment: “Someone has to do what I call ‘heart-mining’,” Tom said, “It is amazing though you can’t always see it, what a huge number of people care for our rivers and fish!”
- Vision: “We may not always have known what ours was,” Tom said, “but we knew that our vision was not dysfunctional government! We knew it had to be community authority and involvement.”
- Education: Tom explained that this is at the individual, community and government levels and stressed that it is an on-going process. He quoted again from *Cows Make the Best Burgers*, saying “‘You all have to do your homework... However, then you have to go with your intuition without letting your mind get in the way!’”
- Be issue-focused, but action-based: Tom noted that “once you discover what the community ‘s passion is for, then you just go from there...”

In closing, Tom noted that the greatest barrier for ARMS has been the lack of authority to “take certain issues to the next level.”

NICOLA WATERSHED STEWARDSHIP AND FISHERIES AUTHORITY & THE B.C. FIRST NATIONS EXPERIENCE – ARNIE NARCISSE

Arnie opened his comments by presenting the position of the BC Aboriginal Fisheries Commission position:

- We endorse the adoption of a community and watershed based habitat restoration strategy as implied in the discussion document for this forum. However, we must point out that this concept, and its associated infrastructure, is already in place in most parts of the province. Another layer of bureaucracy is not needed, especially at the regional or community level.
- We strongly urge DFO to utilize existing processes that include First Nations for implementation of funding. Do not tie funding to specific positions as described in the forum material namely “Stewardship Coordinator” or “Habitat Auxiliary.” Maybe what is most needed at the local level is an accountant, or a comptroller, or a habitat assessment biologist. *Do not impose a “Stewardship Coordinator”* where it may not be wanted or needed.
- *Provide the funding and let the local organization use it wherever it’s needed.*
- *The most effective way to deliver any dollars is through AFS (Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy):*
 - This will enhance DFO (AFS) capacity to address a multitude of fishery management issues with First Nations communities not participating in AFS at the present;

- This will enhance capacity at the community level, and will enhance the formation of partnerships and involvement of the community at large in habitat work.
- It is a demonstrated fact that putting funding resources in the hands of First Nations will result in a reaching out to the community at large. Examples are the recent Fisheries Renewal BC initiatives and DFO funding to a variety of communities such as Skeetchestn, the Nicola Tribal Association, etc. When funding and positions go to the non-Native community, the result is the gradual exclusion of the Native community. An example is the Salmon River Round Table. This does not bode well for watershed based initiatives or future land and resource based relationships.
- *Do not set up a new program.* It is inevitable that inefficiencies and intra-departmental competition will develop. A major portion of new funds should be set aside in Legacy Trust Funds. Interest earned would be used to fund habitat associated work in perpetuity. Delivery of funding can and should be through AFS.

Arnie then used a series of slides to illustrate some of the work of the Nicola Watershed Stewardship and Fisheries Authority and its various restoration and habitat enhancement projects. Arnie's key message was that First Nations programs such as NWSFA have the capacity and capability to manage habitat projects, and reiterated the BCAFC proposal for program funding available under Resource Rebuilding to be directed through AFS.

3.6 PRESENTATION: THE NEED FOR COMMUNITY GROUPS TO MOVE TO ADVOCACY FOR THE PROTECTION OF FISH HABITAT

GREG MALLETTE, PLANNER, DFO HABITAT AND ENHANCEMENT BRANCH (PRESENTED FOR HOWARD PAISH)

Greg presented the findings of a Howard Paish report entitled *An Assessment of Community-Based Processes and Organizations, 1999*. Howard was out of the country due to prior commitments.

Greg opened his presentation by stating that "there is a need to redefine the role of community groups. Community groups must evolve from providing a 'bio-technical' extension service to government agencies (i.e., running hatcheries, stream inventory work, restoration projects, etc.) to becoming advocates for the protection of fish habitat. DFO has traditionally been reluctant to support this type of activity, but is realizing this new direction is necessary to stem the ongoing loss of fish habitat. There is tremendous potential for community groups to advocate for fish habitat within and outside of government planning processes." He continued to expand on this theme as follows:

- It is not uncommon for a community group to spend years of volunteer hours and thousands of dollars rebuilding a portion of a stream, only to see a land use activity upstream destroy their project (i.e., the development of residential areas which changes the stream hydrology and sediment load, a military tank training exercise, logging activity, etc.) Therefore, it is not enough to focus on working in the stream; community groups must get involved in the many land planning exercises that directly or indirectly impact fish habitat. When there is no identifiable planning process, they must engage in traditional lobbying activities.
- There is a need to distinguish the role of community groups from that of government agencies. Having a community group operate a hatchery or spend their time on restoration and enhancement work, is little more than an extension of what the agencies should and can do on their own. Community groups must spend some of their effort building support for fish habitat at all levels of their community. This includes lobby local government in the Official Community Plan (OCP) process, participating in a local Water Use Plan where there is a dam in their watershed, etc. The real value added of community groups is as advocates for fish habitat protection at all levels of government, from the neighbourhood to the federal level. Members of community groups are seen as residents and voters and are respected as such. It is also recognized that even though we have a powerful piece of legislation in the federal Fisheries Act, bureaucrats need the active support of community groups in administering it in local government planning processes, Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs), etc.

Greg explained that five different types of community group activity have been identified. “It is recognized that each can play an important role in the protection of fish habitat and that one group can evolve to another level over time,” he said.

- a) Small scale local initiatives with a particular interest in a particular site – a small stream, a stream reach, etc. Has an inventory, enhancement and restoration focus.
- b) Streamkeeper groups, local enhancement societies, and fish and game clubs, etc., looking to a small stream, watershed or a tributary of a larger river as a unit of fish habitat. Has a focus similar to level 1 but with an added planning focus.
- c) Well established groups operating on a larger watershed basis taking an ecosystem approach. Groups at this level are concerned with governance and overall watershed planning.
- d) A Watershed Council. This level can incorporate the interests of the three lower level groups with the broader interests of other watershed users and resource sectors. Cross sectoral planning for all resources.

- e) The broad, coast-wide community. This incorporates the concerns of quite different geographic communities that are linked to through a common interest in the fishery.

Greg explained that community groups not only occupy different levels of activity, they also work at different levels of effectiveness. “The seven criteria of an effective community group outlined below, are not only designed to identify the stronger groups, but also help others identify where they can increase their effectiveness.”

- Representative of the community and have the support from a broad range of interests. DFO cannot deliver this and needs the community groups to build this type of support for fish habitat protection in and beyond their community.
- Stable functioning group.
- Knowledge and understanding of community functions. The group should have a basic understanding of civics.
- Financial stability. The group must be able to establish clear financial goals and adhere to budgets.
- Track record of accomplishments.
- An understanding of development and approval processes that affect fish habitat.
- Diversified source of funding. The wider the breadth of funding the less vulnerable to changes in funding.

In closing, Greg concluded that “communities must engage in fish habitat advocacy within formal and informal processes and forums. All the different resource user groups are fighting for the use of the land in line with their interests. If communities do not advocate for the use of the land as supporting fish habitat, it may end up being used to support urban development, industrial forestry, mining and agriculture, etc. In addition to advocacy, community groups are encouraged to continue with the traditional enhancement and restoration work.”

3.7 PRESENTATION: A FIRST NATIONS PERSPECTIVE

FRED FORTIER, BC ABORIGINAL FISHERIES COMMISSION

Fred began by acknowledging that “there have been troubling times in the relationships between First Nations and others in the past 10 years. But it is time to move forward in partnership for the betterment of the fish. The New Direction program is an opportunity to move forward.” Fred suggested that “we need to build on existing successful stewardship and enhancement projects that First Nations communities... throughout BC... have been involved in.”

Fred pointed out that First Nations have been building capacity in all aspects of fisheries management since the inception of the Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy (AFS). And he argued that First Nations need to contribute to fisheries enhancement and management, and participate in meaningful, consensus decision-making processes. He also suggested that there is a need to “establish a clear role for Habitat Auxiliaries... The role needs to be defined by the community, not from outside.”

Fred also identified a need:

- for a framework for First Nations involvement in fisheries restoration;
- for better program coordination;
- for organization within watershed planning areas “so that we know what is going on across the landbase”;
- for greater planning at the local level – not just at the strategic (LRMP) level; and,
- to identify gaps in existing programming between provincial and federal agencies.

He also suggested that one of the measures of success for the program would be effective local delivery. “We need to develop a strategic linkage between community based management and federal/provincial habitat planning,” he concluded. He also suggested that DFO design appropriate supporting policies with First Nations to support First Nations involvement in management.

He reiterated his support for a Trust Fund to provide longer term funding for habitat and conservation projects. He also noted that “we need to bring back balance to our watersheds... It is up to communities to make this happen.” In closing, he cautioned however that “we can bring back the habitat, but it is up to the federal government to bring back the fish!”

3.8 PRESENTATION: OVERVIEW OF THE HABITAT CONSERVATION AND STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM

Two presentations outlined the preliminary framework for the positions proposed under the Resource Rebuilding program.

STEWARDSHIP COORDINATORS – MARK JOHNSON, A/CHIEF, COMMUNITY PROGRAMS, DFO

Mark began by quoting Steven Covey’s maxim that all initiatives should “begin with the end in mind.” In this case, he pointed out, the ends for this new programming initiative are: habitat protection and optimum productivity in the long term that is community delivered. He pointed out however, that the habitat conservation and stewardship program is “not the be all and end all... we still need enforcement and other management activities.”

Mark outlined a series of principles that he proposed should drive the program:

- flexibility;
- improvement of knowledge;
- community capacity building – training local people and empowering them to manage watersheds with confidence and over the long term;
- creation of a stewardship ethic – through public education, awareness and involvement; and,
- cooperative action.

Mark continued by citing 3 of the top 10 lessons learned from studies of watershed stewardship work in BC and in other jurisdictions, as follows:

1. *Having a Coordinator at the watershed level is desirable.* The role of such a coordinator could include:
 - assisting in watershed planning process;
 - preparation of action plans;
 - watershed project coordination;
 - facilitation;
 - training/committees /workshops;
 - accessing funding; and,
 - public education.
2. *Planning is key:* long term watershed protection requires planning, including both watershed-specific planning and linkage with other planning processes
3. *Partnerships are key:*
 - engaging all key interests in the watershed;
 - requiring hard work; and,
 - demanding a long term commitment.

Mark continued to explore a model of teamwork that Stewardship Coordinators would adopt through which they would cooperate, for example, with Habitat Auxiliaries, Habitat Technicians, and Community Advisors. He suggested that Coordinators could be given crucial support, advice and even mentoring from DFO staff. To support this proposal, he cited various examples of stewardship initiatives where such teamwork has demonstrated success, such as in the Comox Valley and in the Alouette River Watershed.

Mark suggested that one of the stated goals of the program is to create community capacity. He said, “the program can jump start community

groups, and move them towards self-reliance and sustaining their efforts.”

In closing, Mark outlined the likely products and results of the work of the Stewardship Coordinators:

- watershed management plans;
- fish production plans;
- protected areas; and,
- community awareness and participation.

These results, he suggested would lead to optimum habitat productivity, sustainable salmon runs, and healthy watersheds.

HABITAT AUXILIARIES – MELODY FARRELL, LAND USE PLANNING UNIT, DFO

Melody began her presentation by outlining that the intention of the program is to establish a network of positions, and to be “pro-active and pre-emptive in addressing habitat issues. We want to get out ahead of the normal development and referral process by building broader public support and involvement in stewardship through activities that are ‘issue based and action oriented.’”

She then summarized some of the key messages heard by the Coho Response Team:

- Focus on protection/conservation.
- Increase knowledge and understanding.
- Create incentives.
- Build will.
- Enhance enforcement.

Melody then outlined that following on from these suggestions, the focus of the *New Directions* initiative is:

- impact prevention;
- changing ethics and practices; and,
- influencing decision making.

She noted that “these last two require sustained effort... hence the creation of Habitat Auxiliaries.”

Melody then turned to consideration of how the goals of the program could be achieved. She proposed the following approaches:

- Improve the information base.
- Increase awareness.
- Provide technical advice.

- Monitor compliance.
- Investigate infractions.
- Link the community to decision making.

These approaches, she continued, require two distinct roles, as follows:

- Legislative roles that require authority – therefore likely to be agency staff:
 - project approvals/authorizations
 - inspections/investigations
 - prosecutions
- Non-legislative roles that require other kinds of expertise – therefore likely to be contractors:
 - inventory/information collection
 - technical advice/guidance
 - education/awareness
 - project monitoring

Melody also discussed the relationship between Habitat Auxiliaries and other DFO Habitat Staff, suggesting that this relationship could be organized in different ways:

- geographic, or
- by development sector, or
- by function.

Melody also pointed out that reporting relationships will vary and should be flexible, but suggested that accountability accords will likely be required. She also suggested that teamwork would be essential, and described how Auxiliaries would work in teams with:

- DFO Habitat staff;
- Stewardship Coordinators (SC's) and Community Advisors (CA's);
- approval agencies;
- proponents; and/or,
- community.

She provided examples of Auxiliary/ Industry Sector Partnerships, such as:

- Agriculture Auxiliary; or,
- Urban Development Auxiliary.

Melody also offered examples of functional Habitat Auxiliaries:

- Regional Stewardship Institute/Center support;

- Inventory/mapping technicians;
- Project compliance monitors;
- Educators/trainers; and,
- Technical support to watershed councils.

In closing, Melody outlined expected products and results from Habitat Auxiliaries:

- a new ethic;
- decision making that respects fish habitat;
- changes to perceptions/practices/policies;
- community awareness/participation; and,
- improved protection.

3.9 WORKING GROUP RESULTS

During the second day of the forum, participants broke into 16 concurrent working groups to address the following questions:

- How do the key elements of cooperative planning and management apply in this context?
- What specific recommendations can we offer for the development and implementation of the program to build on opportunities and overcome constraints?
- What should the scope of responsibilities be for Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators?

Working groups convened around specific topic areas, as reflected in the titles, below.

3.9.1 LINKING *A NEW DIRECTION* WITH EXISTING MULTI-STAKEHOLDER WATERSHED STEWARDSHIP INITIATIVES

Two working groups met to discuss the linkages between *A New Direction* and existing multi-stakeholder watershed stewardship initiatives. In response to the first workshop question, the first group identified the key elements of cooperative planning and management between DFO and communities as:

- flexibility to adapt the program implementation to local community needs;
- the capacity for community groups to define job descriptions for Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators; and,
- shared decision making on program implementation between community groups and the federal government.

This group made the following observations and specific recommendations on implementation of the program:

- Poor communication and issues around overlapping federal and provincial programs need to be addressed prior to implementation. For example, linkages with Fisheries Renewal BC are unclear.
- A coordinated effort to share information will be critical to success. Stewardship Coordinators could provide an important function in establishing liaison between regional groups and developing project partnerships.
- A demonstrated commitment to listening to community suggestions and incorporating them into program delivery will be important. The group stated that plan implementation should be a cooperative effort between DFO and community groups, with capacity building within community stewardship groups as a high priority.
- Program implementation needs to be an inclusive process, involving all concerned citizens and groups.
- There should be a long term commitment to government funding to ensure that the program has a lasting impact. Secure, multi-year funding to support long-term community involvement in habitat protection and conservation is a high priority. Groups are forced to spend too much of their time fund raising instead of “getting on with the job”.
- DFO should not create additional positions where they are not necessary. DFO should direct funding to existing watershed/stewardship groups and support their development.
- The program should assist groups with developing their own source of expertise to alleviate bottlenecks in DFO/MELP. Community groups should have more technical capacity so that they do not have to rely on DFO technical support as much as they do now.

The group made the following observations and specific recommendations on the roles of the Stewardship Coordinators (SC) and Habitat Auxiliaries (HA):

- The job descriptions must be flexible not standardized. There needs to be flexibility in developing the job descriptions specific to the needs of local communities and situations. The scope of activities undertaken by SC/HAs should be directed by the community.
- Funding should be directed to community groups to undertake the SC and HA roles.
- HA/SCs should be pro-active rather than reactive; for example, going to local councils and engineering departments to discuss critical issues rather than being in a reactive mode.
- The roles of HA/SCs should complement existing DFO activities and

avoid duplication. In particular, the different roles of Community Advisors, Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators needs to be clarified.

- Some participants felt that SC/HAs should not get involved in enforcement issues but instead should report enforcement concerns to Fisheries Officers; in other words, the SC/HAs should not have any legislative responsibilities.
- SC/HA responsibilities could be handled by several individuals based on their specific abilities, with part time responsibilities, rather than undertaken by one person full time.
- SC/HAs roles should tie into watershed management planning.

The second group addressing linkages between *A New Direction* and existing multi-stakeholder watershed planning initiatives made a number of similar observations, emphasizing the need for the program implementation to be flexible and community-specific, with different approaches in urban and rural communities, fishing communities and forestry communities. This group was also concerned that the program be properly coordinated with Fisheries Renewal BC to avoid duplication of effort and that SC/HA roles be clearly defined in relation to the existing Community Advisor positions. This group made the following additional points:

- The program must be founded on principles of conservation and sustainability and be based on mutual trust and honesty between government agencies and community groups.
- Realistic geographic boundaries must be determined for areas of responsibility under the program, based on watershed boundaries.
- Notwithstanding *A New Direction*, DFO must increase its enforcement capacity to ensure that habitat protection and enhancement work is not undermined.

The second also supported a community-driven hiring process that would build capacity within communities. Additional observations and recommendations were as follows:

- SC/HA positions should coordinate with strategic plans already in process within the community.
- There is a need for a position in each community, especially northern communities that are logistically and geographically isolated.
- New positions should be allocated on the basis of local knowledge and skill level – not for political reasons.
- SC/HAs should be responsible to an umbrella group such as a watershed council or management society and hired by the community.
- SC/HAs could provide “one-stop” shopping for watershed concerns by

coordinating with all agencies and stakeholders within the planning area and providing information and liaison between various programs and agencies.

- The kind of position will vary widely by region (the example was given that north coast and less populated areas have a greater need for Habitat Auxiliaries and technical help whereas populated areas have a greater need for Stewardship Coordinators due to a greater number of stewardship groups and activities that require coordination).

In addition, this group expressed some concerns and reservations about implementation of this program, specifically:

- The lack of trust of DFO within some communities is an obstacle that needs to be acknowledged and addressed.
- There is a lack of information filtering down to community from government agencies and stewardship groups that needs to be addressed.
- There is a concern that DFO will withdraw existing resources after creating these new positions if there is too much overlap in job responsibilities.

3.9.2 LINKING A NEW *DIRECTION* WITH PROVINCIAL CROWN LAND USE PLANNING

The main points raised by this group were:

- Current provincial legislation is inadequate to protect fish habitat. Fish habitat is inadequately protected under the riparian management and wildlife habitat provisions of the Forest Practices Code of British Columbia.
- Endangered species legislation is needed as a bottom line to provide for ecological sustainability and ecosystem protection.
- Communities need to have more authority to examine and address fisheries habitat concerns in provincial planning processes; community input into habitat protection is not sufficiently respected and incorporated into Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP).
- There is a need for stronger and more consistent representation of conservation interests in provincial land use planning processes
- Habitat protection should be a first priority in provincial land use plans.
- LRMPs have failed to deal with First Nation's values. Many First Nations do have the resources to adequately participate in these processes.
- Provincially-designated 'higher level' plans need to be stronger (provide clearer habitat protection) than they do now.
- DFO should have more say in provincial Crown land use decisions, in order to protect fish habitat.

- The 12% cap on protected areas designations is inappropriate; the amount of habitat that needs to be protected to ensure viability of species should determine the extent of protected areas, not an arbitrary cap.
- LRMPs should be driven by an over-riding conservation ethic that underlies all discussion and decision making. Ecological sustainability not economic sustainability, should be the driving force.

The group offered several specific recommendations on changes to provincial legislation and policies to address perceived weaknesses in fisheries habitat protection. These include strengthening legislative protection for riparian areas, introducing endangered species legislation, and amending the Forest Act to require fish habitat conservation and sustainability.

The group's recommendations on the scope and responsibilities of SC/HAs were as follows. Habitat Auxiliaries should:

- come from the local area or DFO should train a local person;
- commit to working in a geographic area for three to five years to ensure continuity, local knowledge, better moral and incentive to do a good job; and,
- be accountable to the community, and not to a government agency.

The group stated that Habitat Auxiliaries should have knowledge of legislation and report enforcement concerns to Fisheries Officers. For example, Habitat Auxiliaries could act as “streamwatchers” to ensure riparian zones are protected. However, the group felt that the appropriate role for Habitat Auxiliaries should be as a “go between or ambassador,” acting in a liaison capacity within the community, not in an enforcement role.

3.9.3 LINKING A NEW DIRECTION WITH GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING

The group made points similar to those made by other groups – that the reporting relationships of the Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators to DFO and community groups needs to be clarified (including the geographic area of responsibility of these positions) and that *A New Direction* needs to be integrated with other planning initiatives to avoid duplication of effort. Some additional key points raised by the group were as follows:

- The community should determine the program scope in the local context.
- The program should be used to build capacity for communities to develop watershed plans.
- Effort should be directed at determining the carrying capacity of urban areas in order to identify limits to growth. Comprehensive and accurate information about habitat is needed to do this.

- Carrying capacity issues and fish habitat protection need to be better integrated into Official Community Plans (OCP).

On the roles and responsibilities of Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators, the group supported the conclusion of several other working groups that there should be local advertising for the positions and that local community groups should have input into the job descriptions before hiring commences. With regard to the roles of SC/HAs, key points made by this group were as follows. HA/SCs should:

- be proactive in taking the initiative in municipal and regional planning, not reactive (e.g., maintain habitat integrity through OCPs);
- provide education and extension services to build awareness of fish habitat issues and to facilitate and coordinate the existing resources in the community;
- assist in the compilation of habitat inventory information and development of best management practices in a local context;
- come to the job with a good skill set and not require substantial training; and,
- help coordinate and integrate federal and provincial government programs and have a good understanding of intergovernmental relations.

One of the key elements supported by this group is that Habitat Auxiliaries should provide support for the group to approach municipal councils with fish habitat concerns and proposed solutions. Concerns were raised by this group that HA positions were posted by DFO before there had been adequate consultation with local groups.

3.9.4 BUILDING BRIDGES BETWEEN *A NEW DIRECTION* AND FIRST NATIONS

Two working groups examined the linkages between *A New Direction* and First Nations interests and concerns. One group identified the key elements of cooperative planning in relation to First Nations as follows:

- Acknowledge First Nations rights and title.
- Incorporate First Nations holistic management and traditional knowledge into program delivery.
- Provide adequate and consistent funding to ensure that programs involving First Nations can be carried out to completion.
- Involve First Nations in planning processes and make sure that their input is meaningfully sought and incorporated throughout the whole process.
- Improve training and reporting mechanisms so that aboriginal fisheries officers can identify and report on problem areas and habitat violations to DFO.

- Establish a central location for sharing information on habitat management.
- Stream-line intergovernmental processes and policies so that everyone has a common understanding of how to manage watersheds.
- Increase local authority and enforcement capability of aboriginal fisheries officers to manage and look after fisheries habitat in First Nations traditional areas.

A key recommendation of this group is that a First Nations program should be developed to implement *A New Direction* specifically for First Nations. The First Nations program would be independent of DFO and managed by First Nations. The First Nations program could consist of:

- a team that would travel to communities to promote awareness of fish habitat concerns and educate people about fish habitat conservation and restoration;
- long-term stewardship capacity building within First Nations communities, with a focus on training and employment of First Nations youth; and,
- better coordination of provincial and federal programs.

Additional points raised and recommendations were that:

- The Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy (AFS) is proposed as one appropriate mechanism for implementing this program, involving a protocol agreement between the federal government and First Nations.
- Program delivery should address the fact that there are many smaller salmon streams that are important but are not getting attention because of the focus on large, commercially important streams.
- Regional Trust Funds should be established to provide long-term funding to implement the program, rather than spending the entire program funding over a few years.
- First Nations individuals should be encouraged to apply for the SC and HA positions.

Specific recommendations with regard to the roles and responsibilities of Stewardship Coordinators and Habitat Auxiliaries are as follows.

Stewardship Coordinators should:

- be responsible to First Nations;
- provide a 'constructive bridge' between First Nations and other stewardship initiatives;
- help to secure funding and develop partnerships in support of local stewardship initiatives;
- initiate public involvement within communities to address habitat concerns;

- assist First Nations in contributing to government decision making processes;
- coordinate training and education of volunteers;
- develop strong working relationships with all First Nations; and,
- have roles and responsibilities defined in local First Nations agreements.

Concerns were raised with regard to Habitat Auxiliaries. The HA role was perceived to overlap with the responsibilities of Aboriginal Fisheries Officers (AFO). The group recommended that the responsibilities of Habitat Auxiliaries be blended with AFOs. It was recommended that the program should be implemented so as to expand the habitat protection capacity and authority of First Nations. Habitat Auxiliaries would be expected to play a role in habitat restoration activities (e.g., writing proposals and coordinating projects).

The second group addressing linkages between *A New Direction* and First Nations made similar points to the first group, particularly that:

- Implementation of *A New Direction* should not be delivered in a “cookie cutter” fashion – there are existing structures that should be used and *A New Direction* should not get in the way of what is already in place.
- There is a need to address allocation and management of stocks together with habitat objectives. Excess fishing capacity and over-harvesting are more critical issues than habitat loss and degradation in some regions.
- There needs to be political will and a policy framework in place to address the delegation of authority for local fisheries management to First Nations. There is a lack of trust because the minister has rejected previous proposals for joint resource management.
- Workshops should be organized within First Nations communities to develop the goals and objectives of the program.
- The program must be defined to meet local community needs, developed in consultation with local First Nations communities. The capacity of the community must be built into the design and delivery of the program.
- The role of First Nations is essential in habitat and stock restoration and management. The constitutional recognition of First Nations can be reconciled with the public interest in rebuilding salmon stocks.
- It is essential that there be continuity of funding and long range planning and policies to ensure that there is a legacy for the future. Long term funds should be available for each major watershed.
- Accountability needs to be clearly defined, e.g., between DFO and communities and vice versa.
- Management should address not only anadromous fish, but entire ecosystems.

On the specific roles and responsibilities of SC/HAs, this group made the following points:

- The positions must include an educational component, for example to explain that the public interest will be better served by addressing First Nations rights to better habitat and stock management.
- Positions should be staffed and managed at the local First Nations level, and not be DFO positions.
- SC/HAs should have enforcement powers.
- SC/HAs should play a key organizing and coordinating function within the community, bringing local people together under a community-based organization, providing technical assistance, mediating between different groups, developing proposals, etc.

If the position is filled by a non-First Nations individual, that person should be prepared to take cross-cultural training and “work themselves out of a job.”

3.9.5 LINKING A NEW *DIRECTION* WITH THE YUKON LAND CLAIMS UMBRELLA FINAL AGREEMENT

This group discussed the linkages between *A New Direction* and the Yukon Land Claims Umbrella Final Agreement (UFA). Summary recommendations developed by this group were as follows:

- The Yukon is a separate political entity from BC and has a distinct way of doing business stemming from the settlement of a comprehensive land claim. An infrastructure is in place to manage and administer a Yukon portion of this program.
- Delegation of a portion of the overall New Direction budget is required for implementation in the Yukon.
- Consultations with community representatives will be undertaken in the Yukon to determine how this program should be delivered (in Feb 99). It is essential that sufficient funding exists to allow community and First Nations participation in these consultations.
- A trust fund should be established to ensure long term funding of program delivery.

Additional points raised by this group were as follows:

- The program provides an opportunity to put people into the community in support of the Renewable Resource Councils established under the UFA.
- SC/HA positions could be established for each traditional territory.
- Some of the program budget should be dedicated to providing long-term funding support (e.g., like the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board).

- Funds need to be distributed where the need is greatest, focusing on the salmon.
- Leave the positions flexible to best deliver the needs of the resource (e.g., contract positions to the Yukon Salmon Committee may be an option).
- Enforcement responsibility may need to be tailored to the community needs and capacity.
- Regional forums should be organized for groups around the Pacific region to share experiences, techniques and applications.
- The scope of the positions should be to provide expertise to local communities.

3.9.6 LINKING *A NEW DIRECTION* WITH WATER USE PLANNING

This group discussed the linkages between *A New Direction* and water use planning. Key elements of cooperative planning and management identified by this group were as follows:

- Raise awareness of the water use planning process among all interests, including goals, objectives, and intended outcomes of the process.
- Include all stakeholders in the process (i.e., residents, stewardship groups, farmers, resource users, licensees, etc.) and facilitate stakeholder participation by providing information, resources and support.
- Uncover and understand underlying interests and values of process participants and identify benefits of participation.
- Provide liaison between different groups involved in the process.

Recommendations on the development of *A New Direction* as it links to water use planning included the following:

- SC/HAs should come from the community and already be familiar with key people and the issues.
- Deployment of positions should be linked to factors such as fish production, intensity of impacts on fish habitat, population density and status of regional advocacy groups (where no community group exists, Stewardship Coordinators can help build advocacy capacity).
- SC/HAs should meet regularly to exchange information on progress province-wide.
- DFO control over SC/HA positions should vary from complete to very little depending on local capacity.
- The program should facilitate long term education, awareness and capacity building and build on existing infrastructure within communities.
- SC/HA positions should be developed and filled from local communities

with community groups involved in the hiring process. SC/HAs should not be DFO employees.

On the role and responsibilities of Stewardship Coordinators, the group made the following recommendations. Stewardship Coordinators should:

- encourage community awareness and participation in water use planning (WUP) and other relevant planning processes;
- provide information and support for participation (e.g., training, resources (money and information, and liaison with other groups);
- provide communication, facilitation and dispute resolution support to community groups;
- have project management abilities, and be able to take community members ideas and turn them into projects and actions;
- make contact with municipal governments and arrange presentations on behalf of community groups;
- provide expertise on, and access to, federal and provincial government programs; and,
- be people and process-oriented but have a technical background.

On the role and responsibilities of Habitat Auxiliaries, the group made the following recommendations. Habitat Auxiliaries should:

- provide technical ‘on the ground’ support and coordination for specific projects;
- have enforcement capability;
- monitor implementation and compliance with WUPs;
- be kept informed of the referral process on specific projects; and,
- help to build long-term stewardship capacity within communities.

3.9.7 REFINING PRINCIPLES FOR WATERSHED PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT: TOWARDS A NEW MODEL

Three working groups met to discuss principles to guide cooperative watershed planning and management. These groups identified the following principles as keys to success:

- Community groups should be encouraged and supported to undertake watershed planning. This will require effective community consultation, coordination and capacity building.
- Mutual trust, respect and cooperation among all those involved in watershed planning is essential.
- There should be easy access to government information and data for all groups involved in watershed planning.

- Watershed planning processes should be open, inclusive, and accountable. Decision making should be based on consensus.
- Watershed planning processes should include mechanisms to monitor implementation and evaluate progress against specific objectives for improved watershed conditions.
- Watershed planning should be ecosystem-based, not resource-based (e.g., address water resources, wildlife, etc.).
- Watershed planning should be linked to decision-making authority and not done in isolation from decision makers.
- Watershed planning should include a long-term component in addition to short term projects.
- Continuity should be encouraged by having the same team undertake watershed planning and implementation.
- Pre-existing local stewardship efforts should be acknowledged and incorporated into watershed planning. Legitimize past and on-going volunteer efforts.
- Funding should be directed to priority watershed projects based on need and not be driven by funding sources.
- Secure funding should be established to meet the requirements for long-term rehabilitation of watersheds (e.g., through establishment of a trust fund with the funds under *A New Direction*).

Specific recommendations on implementation of the program included the following:

- Look for success stories and develop templates that work.
- Establish a results-oriented start-up to get things going quickly.
- Ensure that the program delivery is community-driven.
- Provide facilitation and/or mediation where planning has not been initiated or has stalled.
- Identify and develop incentives for good watershed stewardship (and disincentives for poor stewardship).
- Establish a provincial “watershed information clearing house” to actively compile and share information and experiences in watershed management. (Provide ‘one-stop shopping’ for information and knowledge).
- Explore ways to derive benefits for communities that do not benefit directly from the end results of watershed rehabilitation.
- Ensure coordination of program implementation with other federal programs and provincial programs and avoid duplication of effort; build synergies wherever possible.

- Recognize the linkages between watershed management and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and address related impacts.
- Let communities establish the criteria for hiring Stewardship Coordinators and Habitat Auxiliaries; DFO's role is to ensure a fair and equitable hiring process.
- Make sure the program fully acknowledges the important role of volunteers and encourages their continued efforts.
- Incorporate watershed planning principles and policies into Official Community Plans (OCPs).
- Include a significant public education component to promote a conservation stewardship ethic within communities.

On the roles and responsibilities of Stewardship Coordinators and Habitat Auxiliaries, points raised by these groups include the following:

- Stewardship Coordinators should build local advocacy capability by educating and networking, identifying and encouraging 'spark plug' types within the community ("heart-mining"), and seeking and maintaining funding for community stewardship projects.
- Habitat Auxiliaries should have a scientific grounding and provide technical advice, but be flexible in adapting to local needs.
- SC/HAs should be proactive and have prevention of further habitat loss as a first priority. They should provide strong consistent community direction to local governments on watershed management issues.

As with some other working groups, there were differing perspectives as to whether SC or HA positions should be DFO employees or contracted-out to community groups, and whether they should have enforcement capabilities or not. Some people felt that SC/HAs should focus on preventing further habitat loss but not have regulatory authority, and could best do their essential community capacity building functions by working directly for local stewardship groups not DFO. Others felt that some enforcement capability is needed.

3.9.8 LINKING A NEW DIRECTION WITH INDUSTRY AND DEVELOPERS

Two working groups discussed linkages between *A New Direction* and industry and developers. Key elements of watershed planning and management identified by these groups were as follows:

- Ensure cooperation among all stakeholders from the initiation of planning through to enforcement. It was felt that accounting for, and reporting on, the benefits to industry and land owners of effective watershed planning will be instrumental in gaining their cooperation. Effective enforcement also creates the conditions for cooperation.

- Create appropriate incentives and disincentives. Conservation covenants, tax incentives, cost sharing, ‘green’ marketing and other mechanisms are means to create ‘win-win’ situations and promote better stewardship by the business sector.
- Provide education and awareness of the benefits of good watershed stewardship as well as examples of practical success stories that industry sectors can relate to. Tailor the education for each industry group.
- Address all impacts of development at the watershed level and include all user groups in the planning process.
- Learn from the past and highlight techniques and projects that have worked with industry groups in other jurisdictions.
- Provide certainty for industry with clear objectives and rules so that these can be built into development decisions and designs. Give industry the opportunity to create a positive community profile by showing them what they can do to make a difference.
- Provide consistency by streamlining and coordinating various government agencies policies and programs. Lack of coordination between government agencies is a problem.
- Governments should lead by example and demonstrate the alternative ways of doing things rather than just pointing out the problems.

These groups made a number of points with regard to implementation of the program and the role of SCs and HAs:

- The program and SC/HA positions should build on existing stewardship initiatives and not “reinvent the wheel.” Funding should be provided to existing groups that have already established good relations with industry sectors and have a track record of success.
- The program should adopt a cooperative and preventative approach in working with industry and developers, rather than reactive and confrontational approach.
- The roles of SC/HAs must be defined locally depending on local circumstances focusing on the functional roles needed (e.g., facilitation, mediation, training, project management, etc.).
- SC/HAs may need to be specialists in a particular industry sector (e.g., ranching, farming, mining, etc.) to build trust and develop industry-specific solutions.
- SC/HAs should act as industry coordinators, facilitating ‘one-stop’ shopping for information and advice on environmental requirements (e.g., developing industry checklists and information packages).
- SC/HAs should be skilled at bringing groups together to address sensitive issues and familiar with local issues.

It was pointed out by both of these working groups that this workshop consultation would have been improved had there been more representation from industry and the development community.

3.9.9 THE ROLE OF HABITAT AUXILIARIES AND STEWARDSHIP COORDINATORS

Two groups convened to discuss the roles of Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators. Key elements of cooperative watershed planning identified by these groups were the following:

- The program goals and delivery need to be flexible and driven by a local community process given that each region has different issues and priorities that need to be addressed and differing resources available.
- The program delivery should build on community-based, existing structures as much as possible, and not contribute to new government bureaucracy. For example, delivery of this program should be closely integrated with the existing Community Advisor positions.
- The program should include a monitoring component to ensure that biophysical knowledge of watershed condition and fish escapement is acquired over the long term. Local history and knowledge of specific stocks is important, and this information is either no longer being collected or is being lost as personnel turn over.
- The program and SC/HA roles should be fish-driven, not politically motivated or driven primarily by employment concerns.
- Geographically distinct areas of responsibility need to be defined for HA/SCs.
- The hiring process for SC/HAs should be fair and open to competition, not by appointment, and kept straightforward.
- There should be fair and equal access to the program for different geographic regions.
- DFO needs to provide tools (e.g., manuals, policy, guidelines, etc.) that local stewardship groups can use and to give their efforts credibility.
- The program must focus on practical, 'implementable' solutions and not get bogged down in endless planning.
- Funds collected through enforcement and fines should be directed to restoration work in the watershed.

As with some other groups, there were differing perspectives on whether the SC/HAs should be DFO employees. Some felt that the hiring of a DFO staff person would avoid local conflict of interest, and provide that person with the legal authority to enforce the Fisheries Act. Others felt that some community-based stewardship groups would be alienated by a DFO employee, a DFO employee would not be free to speak candidly about all the issues, and might not be as free to be creative and innovative.

3.9.10 URBAN WATERSHEDS

One working group convened to discuss the linkages between *A New Direction* and urban watersheds. Key issues identified by this group with regard to watershed planning in urban watersheds were as follows:

- Planning for urban watersheds is highly complex due to population density, significant historical and projected impacts, multiple overlapping jurisdictions and other factors.
- People who live in urban watersheds do not think of themselves as residents of a watershed; significant public education is needed to raise awareness of watershed concerns and the links to the actions of people who live there.
- Solutions to better urban watershed management need to be put in terms that municipal politicians and developers understand, can support and will implement (e.g., the economic advantages for developers to incorporate green spaces, walkways, wildlife habitat into development projects).
- At higher planning levels (provincial and federal) the language of conservation is understood, but at the municipal level and site-specific development level, the intent is often lost.
- Citizens groups often feel unable to influence decision making in favour of conservation concerns in urban watersheds.
- Urban watershed planning is constrained by lack of information and inadequate information sharing. Trust and power sharing are needed to have effective decision making.
- Sustaining funding for urban watershed stewardship is a perennial challenge in the face of changing administrations.

The urban watersheds working group discussed how the implementation of *A New Direction* could benefit stewardship of urban watersheds and made the following recommendations on program delivery and the specific roles and responsibilities of SCs and HAs:

- There needs to be sustained, long-term funding for stewardship groups for them to build capacity and be effective in protecting habitat.
- The proposed position titles need to be changed: ‘coordinator’ implies control and ‘auxiliary’ is subservient. ‘Advisor’ is proposed as an alternative, although the overlap with existing Community Advisor positions needs to be resolved.
- All watersheds should have sufficient positions, based on geographic requirements and demands on the watershed. However, some prioritization of watersheds may be required to ensure that significant watersheds are addressed.

- There needs to be flexibility to adapt the SC/HA positions to local situations and priority needs; the roles will evolve.
- SC/HA personnel should be able to operate in an interdisciplinary environment and be flexible and willing to learn.
- Projects need to have clear outcomes that are measurable to evaluate whether they are working.
- SC/HA positions need to be vested with sufficient authority to have credibility within the community and among agencies and stakeholders.
- SC/HAs need to have sufficient freedom of expression to say what they think and act as advocates for fish and fish habitat.

These groups distinguished the roles and responsibilities of SC/HAs as follows, noting that both Stewardship Coordinators and Habitat Auxiliaries must be fully accountable to the communities in which they operate:

- Stewardship Coordinators should be multi-disciplinary and skilled in facilitating communication and coordination among community stewardship groups as well as between these groups and government agencies. They should be seen as resource people with access to information and resources to help groups undertake stewardship work, including helping with funding applications, budgets, etc. They should have good working relationships with local governments especially, as well as federal and provincial agencies, universities and First Nations. They should be good organizers, able to take advantage of manpower and information, not afraid to try to be fish advocates, and enable advocacy work in the community.
- Habitat Auxiliaries should be more field-based and be involved in monitoring the health of the watershed, collecting data on key watershed attributes. They should be involved in supporting enforcement officials and act as a voice to improve enforcement abilities. They should be able to provide training and technical support to community groups.

A concern was raised in one group that this process of public consultation was not transparent and the question was raised as to whether DFO had already decided on the hiring process for the HA/SC positions and was now trying to get buy-in after the fact.

3.10 CONCLUDING COMMENTS FROM STEERING COMMITTEE

In bringing the forum to a close, members of the Steering Committee were invited to summarize highlights of the event.

3.10.1 FRED FORTIER, BC ABORIGINAL FISHERIES COMMISSION

Fred reiterated that communities should help to determine the direction of the program and its implementation and repeated his appeal to DFO to avoid “empire building.” He also suggested that the success of the program would depend in large part on the incorporation of “principles defining a conservation ethic” from the community level. Fred argued strongly for “openness on the part of the federal government” regarding who administers or manages the new positions of Habitat Auxiliaries and Stewardship Coordinators, noting that perhaps the Salmon Enhancement and Habitat Advisory Board should undertake this role. He closed with two key points:

- DFO must consult with First Nations regarding *A New Direction*; and,
- As stated in the BCAFC submission, a trust fund should be established on a watershed basis to provide on-going support for stewardship initiatives.

3.10.2 RICH CHAPPLE, PACIFIC SALMON FOUNDATION

Rich opened his comments with an observation that “the conservation ethic is alive and well... as evidenced by the number of people participating in this forum.” He also expressed support for the program, saying “we have a new opportunity with field resources,” but cautioned that DFO should consult before implementing new policies, noting “this forum is a good first step.” He stressed that “there is a critical need for flexibility” and argued strongly that the program needs to be client-driven. In closing, he noted that a previous speaker had described the establishment of Community Advisors (CA’s) as ‘one of the best things that DFO ever did,’ and made the point that “this program will have been successful if Stewardship Coordinators and Habitat Auxiliaries are accepted like CA’s.”

3.10.3 TOM CADIEUX, SALMON ENHANCEMENT AND HABITAT ADVISORY BOARD

Tom began by applauding Donna Petrachenko for using the word ‘trustee’ in her comments on the previous day, commenting that a shift towards stewardship requires a change in thinking. Tom continued by arguing that the program should be “facilitation for the community by the community.” He also thanked the committed government agency staff he had been working with to put this forum together and noted that “this gives me hope for the future of the program.” He closed by thanking various members of the Steering Committee and the volunteers that had worked so hard to make this event a success.

3.10.4 TED PERRY, HABITAT AND ENHANCEMENT BRANCH, DFO

Ted began by reiterating thanks to the organizers, staff and participants at the forum for all their hard work and commitment. He noted that the Steering Committee would be working towards a joint press release following the event.

Ted addressed concerns that had been raised by some participants regarding the absence of provincial staff from BC Fish or Fisheries Renewal BC. Ted noted that this forum addressed the topic of stewardship, rather than economic diversification, but stressed that DFO is working with Fisheries Renewal in a number of key areas.

Ted also gave his commitment that the new funding available under the Resource Rebuilding initiative would not be used to replace reductions to funding in other areas. He also pointed out that get the program rolling, some funding has been allocated to establish 12 positions – two in each region – to help get the process rolling.

Finally, Ted stressed that this forum “is a beginning not the end,” and that further steps would be taken to get input prior to the full implementation of the program, including:

- distribution of the Forum Summary Report for review;
- contacts with community groups to solicit input on how the program should be delivered and who should be responsible; and,
- further discussion with the Steering Committee to review input received and to develop final recommendations.

Ted also stressed that DFO is committed to “area based delivery” of the program and “integrated stewardship initiatives.” He expressed the hope that DFO will play the role as a trusted and committed facilitator.”

4 APPENDICES

4.1 SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FORMS

On a scale of 1-5, 70% of respondents rated the workshop overall as “good” (4) to “excellent (5) overall. Only one respondent rated the workshop as “poor” (1). Several comments indicated that there was “too much discussion... especially during Day 1...” and that more time should have been provided for small group discussions.

The words most commonly used to describe people’s feelings about the forum were “interesting” (used 42 times), “organized” (38), “informative” (38), “enjoyable” (22), “stimulating” (21), and “repetitious” (20).

80% of respondents indicated that the forum had achieved the objective of “providing an overview of DFO’s commitment to a new approach.”

63% of respondents indicated that the forum has achieved the objective of “reviewing the current state of fish habitat in BC and the Yukon.”

70% of respondents indicated that the forum has achieved the objective of “exploring models of shared decision-making that expand the role of other levels of government, stakeholders and local communities.”

63% of respondents indicated that the forum has achieved the objective of “clarifying opportunities for integration of fish habitat management with land use, growth management and other planning and decision-making initiatives...”

80% of respondents indicated that the forum has achieved the objective of “identifying key elements of successful models of integrated planning and management.”

72% of respondents indicated that the forum has achieved the objective of “providing specific recommendations for the further development and implementation of the program and for the scope of responsibilities and administrative functions of HA’s and SC’s.”

Almost 25% of respondents indicated support for smaller regional or community workshops-unprompted.

25% of respondents suggested that the most important next step was to “take action... Implementation with recommendations from community and with First Nations input”-unprompted.

On a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), Forum facilitation was rated by 91% of respondents as “good” (4, 48%) or “excellent” (5, 43%). Only one respondent rated the facilitation below average.

On a scale of 1-5, 54% of respondents rated working group facilitators as either “good” (4, 39%) or “excellent” (5, 15%). 20% of respondents rated working group facilitators as either “poor” (1, 10% of respondents) or “fair” (2, 15%).

When asked for suggestions to improve future events of this kind, the most common responses were:

- more time for discussion/question periods, especially in working groups-less presentations (32% of respondents); and,
- smaller rooms for working groups (19%).

4.2 ATTENDEES

Adriane Pollard	District of Saanich	Chief Ka'waintco Shackelly ..	Nicola Tribal Assn
Al Smith	ARMS	Chief Ken Malloway	Sto:lo Nation
Alan Grist	Port Coquitlam Hunting & Fishing Club	Chief Robert Sam	Te'maxw Treaty Assn
Aleria Ladwig	B.C.I.T.	Chief Wayne Edwards	Te'maxw Treaty Assn
Alex Ross	QC Sportsfish	Chris Barnes	Gitksan Watershed Authorities
Alexander (Sandy) Ritchie ...	Fraser River Sports Fish Advisory Board	Chris Noble	Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation
Allen S. Clark	Kingfisher Environmental Center	Chris Picard	B.C. Conservation Foundation
Amelia Reamshottom	Youth Challenge International	Christina Langton	Township of Langley (SRWMP)
Andrew Day	WC Sus. Assoc	Christina Soto	SFU
Angela Smails		Christine Asoto	Notetaker
Angus Mackay	Fisheries Renewal BC	Christine Chapman	BCIT
Anthony Lee	Somenos Marsh Wildlife Society	Christine Hunt	Native Brotherhood Of B.C.
Ardyth Cooper	T'Sooke Nation	Chuck Gosby	Fanny Bay Enhancement Society
Arnie Narcisse	NWSFA	Clinton Young	Com Fisheries Dev. Centre
Barbara Calvert	Notetaker	Craig Davidson	Community Fisheries Development
Barney Stirling	NWSFA	Craig Orr	Watershed Watch
Ben Kangasniemi	BC Ministry of Envir Lands & Parks	Dale Harkness	Harkness Design
Bert Brink	Fraser River Coalition	Dan Edwards	WC Sus. Assoc.
Beryl Guerin	BC Aboriginal Fisheries Commission	Dan Gibbons	Noha's Charters
Bev Bowler	Contractor to DFO-S.E.P.	Daniel Burns	Steelhead Society of BC
Bill Fell	Gitsegukla Band Council	Darren Deluca	West Coast Sustainability/ RAMS
Bill Green	Canadian Columbia River Inter-tribal Fish. Comm.	Daryl Field	BC Hydro
Bill Otway	Rec Fish., DFO	Dave Bodaly	Te'mexui Treaty Association
Bill Spenst	Lake Babine Nation	Dave Chitty	Alberni Valley Enh. Assoc.
Blake Covernton	Pro Plan Services	Dave Gordon	Triton Env.
Bob Fuller	Van Angling & Game Assn	Dave Moore	Shuswap Fisheries
Bob Grant	Com. Fisheries Dev. Centre	Dave Norman	Canadian Communities Institute
Brad Whittaker	Fraser Basin Council	Dave Palidwor	Coquitlam Parks
Bradley C Clark	Kingfisher Environ Interpretive Ctr.	Dave Smith	K.E.E.P.S./RM Watershed Coun.
Brenda Bauer	The Steelhead Society Habitat Restoration Corp.	David Bosnich	Seabird Isld Bd
Brenda Ramsay	NW Enh. Soc	David Coulter	NWSFA
Brian Michel	NWSFA	David Groves	Cowichan Watershed Council
Brian Parke	Nicola Ranch	David Lane	T. Buck Suzuki Environ Foundation
Byron Louis	Okanogan Nation Alliance	David Lightly	T'Soo-ke Nation
Carl Sidney	Yukon Salmon Committee	David Stasele	KEEPS
Carole Perrault	Kwakiutl Territorial Fish Commission	Dawn Cowie	Little Campbell Stewardship Society
Catherine Blackstock	BCAFC	Dawn Machin	Okanogan Nation Fisheries Commission
Catherine Jollymore	The Steelhead Society	Dennis Brown	Ministry of Fisheries
Cathy Hall	BC Aboriginal Fisheries Commission	Dominic Hope	Yale First Nation
Channa Pelpola	Notetaker	Don Chamberlain	Comox Val W
		Don Hall	NuuChah-nulth

Donald Lowen	Watership Foundation	Iona Campagnolo	Fraser Basin Council
Donna Ogden	Veins of Life Watershed Society	Irene Bjerke	YFN Fisheries Stewardship Authority
Dora MacMillan	Baker Ck En. Soc	Jackie Campbell	T-Buck Suzuki
Dorothy Argent	Salmon R. Watershed Roundtable	Jacques Planes	T'sou-ke First Nation
Doug Backhouse		Jake Duncan	Yukon R Com. Fishing Assn
Doug McCorquodale	The Steelhead Society Habitat Restoration Corp.	James Hamly	Tugwell Stewardship Group
Dr. Jutta Rickers-Haunerland	Port Moody Ecological Society	Jane Hope	YFN Fisheries Stewardship Authority
Dr. Parzibal Copes	SFU-Inst. Of Fish. Analysis	Jane Tideman	PSF
Duane Brown	David Suzuki Foundation	Janice Jarvis	Seymour Salmonid Society
Ed Brookman	Chemainus Rod & Gun Club	Jeff Castellias	Veins of Life Watershed Society
Edith Tobe	Squamish R Watershed Soc	Jennifer Atchison	Stoney Creek
Elaine Golds	Burke Mountain Naturalists	Jenny Ljunggren	Alouette River Mgmt. Soc. (ARMS)
Eleanor Jane Hope	Yale First Nation Fisheries Stewardship	Jim Culp	Terrace Sal Enh. Society
Erik Karlsen	Ministry of Municipal Affairs	Jim Helzman	Fisheries Renewal
Faye Smith	Qualicum B	Jitka Petruzelka	Oyster River Enhancement Society
Fiona Wright	West Vancouver Streamkeepers	Joan Viksten	Kwanlin Dun First Nation
Frank Shepherd	Little River Enhancement	Jody Harris	Chemainus Rod and Gun Club
Fred Fortier	BC Aboriginal Fisheries Commission	Joe Bellmore	Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation
Fred Mah	Friends of False Creek	Joe Williams	Dept. of Ecology, State of Washington
G. Thomas	Van. Salmon Stream Soc	John Brohman	Sooke/Renfrew
Gary Gurnsey	CFDC-Stuart Nechako	John Heaven	Bell-Irving Hatchery, Kanaka Creek
Geoff Clayton	Alouette River Mgmt. Soc. (ARMS)	John Irwin	Friends of False Creek
George Farrell	Hecate Strait	John M. Farrell	The Tlell Watershed Society
Geraldine Pope	Kluane First Nation	John Roe	Veins of Life
Gerry Couture	Yukon Salmon Com	John Summers	Ministry of Environment
Gloria Vaillancourt	CCFPA	Joyce Pooley	Adams Lk Band
Gordon Lush	Georgia Strait Sports Fishing Guides	Julie Pavey	City of Port Moody
Gordon Smith	GVRD Parks	Karen Asp	EDL Environment Consultants Ltd.
Graham Strachan	B.C. Ministry of Agriculture & Food	Karen Kinnee	Notetaker
Grant Anderson	Friends of the Marble River	Karen R. Milne	Mosquito Creek Stewardship Society
Greg Burrows		Kathleen Fry	Ducks Unlimited Canada
Greg Taylor	Ocean Fisheries Ltd.	Kathy Campbell	Tsolum River Task Force
Greg Witzky	Adams Lk Band	Kathy Scarfo	SNH Consultants
Gwyn Joiner	Chilliwack Fish and Game	Kelly Goody	Stoney Creek
Hal Baker	B.C. Wildlife Federation	Ken Bierly	Gov Watershed Enh. Board
Heather Deal	Min of Env	Ken Glover	SEHAB
Hilary Buri	Veins of Life Watershed Society	Ken Lewis	FVR Watershed Coal
Howard Baker	BC Federation of Fly Fishers	Ken Vance	Union of BC Municipalities
Hugh Naylor	Pemberton Sportsmen's Wildlife Assoc	Kevin Conlin	MELP
Ian Delisle	Forest Renewal BC	Kim Guerin	BC Aboriginal Fisheries Commission

Kim Ogilvie		Pat Matthew	Shuswap
Krista Payette	Ministry of Environment, Lands & Parks	Pat Slaney	Min of Env
Kristin Thomas	Lyackson First Nation	Pat Tyson	Howe Sound Round Table
Lance Hogmen		Pater Abrams	Notetaker
Larry Greba	Kitasoo Fisheries Program	Patricia Keen	Notetaker
Lars Reese-Hansen	Kitsumkalum Band Council	Paul Berlinguette	West Vancouver Streamkeepers
Laurie Dawson	Comox Vall W Soc	Peter Barnes	ARMS
Laurie McNeil	Hornal Consultants	Peter Broomhall	Watershed Watch Salmon Society
Linda Vandon Berg	Te'mexw Treaty Association	Peter McCully	SEHAB
Lisa Degoes	Notetaker	Raelene Young	Baker CK En. Society
Lisa Fleming	LEPS	Ray Straatsma	Friends of False Creek
Liz Jones	Mt Currie Streamkeepers	Renee Venusio Emery	Yale First Nation Fish Steward Auth
Lorraine Harvey	SEHAB	Rich Chapple	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Lynn Husted	Forest Renewal	Richard J. Behn	Yale First Nation - Treaty Group
Lynne Broekhuizen	SEHAB	Richard Watts	
M.C. Warrior	Central Island Fish Renewal Part	Rick August	Sechelt Band
Malcolm Smith	Fraser Basin	Rick Krehbiel	Lheidli T'enneh Treaty Office & BCAFC
Marcel Shepert	Carrier Sekani Tribal Council	Rick McKaney	CMDC N Fraser
Marion Lightly	Sooke River Watershed Steering Com	Rick Simpson	Van. Natural Hist. Soc., Cons & Educ.
Mark Bowler	Haisla Fisheries Commission	Rob Knight	MELP
Marvin Rosenau	MELP	Robert Gunn	BCIT Fish, Wildlife & Rec Program
Mary-Sue Atkinson	Pacific Fish Res Cons Council	Robert Hope	Yale First Nation
Maurice Coulter-Boivert	Stoney Creek	Robert Malee	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Menno Homan	Bow River Basin	Robert W. Emery	Yale First Nation Fish Steward Auth
Michael Nihls	City of Coquitlam	Roberta Cuthbert-Webber	City of Coq
Michael Roth	Discovery Coast Greenways Land Trust	Rod MacVicar	Centennial School
Michael Wallis	Salmon River Watershed Roundtable	Ron Bertrand	B.C. Ministry of Agriculture and Food
Michelle Carr	District & Saanich	Ross Davies	Alouette River Mgmt. Soc. (ARMS)
Michelle Patterson	Com Fish	Ross Kipp	Yale First Nation Stewardship Authority
Mike Baird	Tsawwassen First Nation	Ross Wetzel	Community Fish Develop. Centre, Surrey
Mike Ballard	Cowichan Watershed Council	Ruth Foster	Centennial School
Mike Bonshor	Sto:lo Development Corp.	Scott Mackay	Nadina Community Futures Development Corp.
Mike Hayhoe	Cowichan Watershed Council	Scott Morrison	
Mike Nicell	SEHAB	Sharlene Hamm	Notetaker
Mike Romaine	BC Watershed Stewardship Alliance	Sharon Chow	Sierra Club of BC
Murray Ross	Shuswap Nation Fisheries Com.	Sharon Mankawske	Kwanlin Dun First Nation
Naomi Palfrey	BCIT	Sid Quinn	Sechelt Band
Natalie Lissimore		Steve Gormley	Reg. District Central Okanagan
Nathaniel Nowland	Notetaker	Steve Litke	BC Watershed Stewardship Alliance
Neil Todd	NWSFA		
Nelson Tallio	Nuxalk Nation		
Nick Page	Coast R Env.		
Pat Alfred	Kwakiutl Territorial Fish Comm		

Steve McDonald	BCIT	Tom Cadieux	SEHAB
Steve Sciatko	BCIT	Tom Stewart	Stoney Creek
Steve Zachary	E.B.A	Trish DeMacedo	Notetaker
Sue Moodie	Yukon Conservation Society	Vanessa Timmer	Notetaker
Susan Anderson Behn		Vicky Troup	Capilano College
Susan Willikins	Friends of False Creek	Wally Vowles	Sooke/Renfrew Forest Society
Suzanne Thomson	Community Fishreies Dev. Centre	Walter Joseph	Wet'suwetien Fisheries
Tammy Cohen	Friends of False Creek	Wayne Harling	BC Wildlife Federation
Tana Plewes	Logical Business Solutions	Wayne Michie	Mickey Fin Charters
Terry Palfrey	BCIT	Wendy Turner	Citizen – Vancouver
Terry Point	Musqueam Fisheries Dept.	Willard Sparrow	Musqueam Fisheries Dept.
Terry Slack	Fraser River Sturgeon Cons Soc	William D. (Bill) McLaren	Parks & Leisure Serv., Maple Ridge
Terry Wells	Kwakiutl Territorial Fish Comm	Yvette Wells	Land Use Coordination Office
Toby Howard	Gitsegukla Band Council	ZoAnn Morten	SEHAB & Pacific Streamkeepers Fed.

