

# **FSC Access Decision Package - Example**

DFO-08426[03-04]

\\svbcvanfp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal Drives\Area Directors\RDG Office\Sharan Johal\Electronic Documents  
001\SDC - Strategic Directions Committee\14 - January 5, 2006\2 - First Nations Mandate Developments  
.doc

CAN352159\_0001

Comox

Allocation Aggregate  
Gulf



2004 Allocation Unit:  
KTFC / AFS / Others

Population: 277

Total Salmon Weight / Cap  
(Sockeye Weight Equivalents)

15.29

49.65 Max  
16.80 Avg  
6.15 Min

Total Population: 6483 Per Capita

2004 Non-Fraser Sockeye:	0	0.00
2004 Fraser Sockeye:	80000	12.49
2004 Total sockeye:	80000	12.49
2004 Chinook:	2000	0.31
2004 Coho:	2500	0.39
2004 Pink:	5000	0.78
2004 Chum:	35000	5.47

Lbs of Halibut, Sabiefish  
and other Groundfish

8.00

23.81 Max  
5.60 Avg  
0.00 Min

Recent salmon harvest +/-  
20% of allocation?

Yes

Recent catches/fishing location  
affected by conservation measures?

Yes

Indications of substantial  
unreported salmon harvest?

Yes

Indications of substantial illegal sales?

Yes

Benefits under ATP?

Yes

Herring Food (t): 11

Halibut(lbs): 28000

Other Groundfish (Lbs): 19000

Herring SOK (t): 35.01

Eulachon(lbs): 0

2004 Allocation Unit ID: 2003

Band ID: 624

2004 Allocation Unit MOD: KTFC / AFS / Others

### Evaluation Sheet for Requests to Increase an Allocation (Illustration)

Criteria	Indicators	Individual Assessment	Grouped Assessment
Legal Issues: Conservation and access priority	Possible conservation concern with any increase?	✓	✓
	Possible violation of access priority if increase not approved?	?	
	Possible infringement on other FSC harvests with any increase?	?	
Diversity and overall abundance of species available for FSC fisheries, and  Existing inequities	Current allocation compared within the Geographic Allocation Unit	Salmon: ✓ Groundfish: X Shellfish: X Other: —	✓
	Current allocation compared within the same setting (coastal or interior)	Salmon: ✓ Groundfish: ✓ Shellfish: ✓ Other: —	
Performance of FSC fisheries	Expected harvests relative to current allocation	Salmon: X Groundfish: — Shellfish: — Other: X	X
	Recent harvest relative to current allocation	Salmon: X Groundfish: — Shellfish: — Other: X	
	Historic harvests relative to current allocation	Salmon: X Groundfish: — Shellfish: — Other: X	
	Use of FSC fish	—	

#### Legend

✓ Supports increasing the allocation  
? Unknown at this time

— Neutral

X Supports not increasing the allocation

**Summary of Key Issues Addressing a Request for Change in Fishing Location by an Aboriginal Group, for Food, Social and Ceremonial Purposes**

Aboriginal Group:

DFO Area:

Summary of Request:

The *(Name of First Nation)* is requesting a change in their fishing location for *(Species and/or stock name)* for FSC purposes on a *(Permanent/Temporary)* basis.

**Summary of Key Criteria and Considerations for a Request to Change in Fishing Location**

<b>Criteria Considered</b>	<b>Key Information</b>	<b>DFO Evaluation</b>
Affected species /stock		
Allocation of affected species/stock		
What are the conservation implications of requested change in fishing location?		
Evidence supporting historic use of the requested fishing area?		
Can the First Nation harvest their allocation in their current fishing location?		
What are the implications for		

<b>Criteria Considered</b>	<b>Key Information</b>	<b>DFO Evaluation</b>
other First Nations of approving the new fishing area?		
Is there a Protocol Arrangement in place between the requesting and affected First Nations?		
What are the implications of approving the new fishing area for Treaty negotiations?		
Other?		

Recommendation and Summary of Supporting Rationale:

**Summary of Key Issues Addressing a Request for an Increase in Allocation by an Aboriginal Group, for Food, Social and Ceremonial Purposes**

Aboriginal Group:

DFO Area:

Summary of Request:

The *(Name of First Nation)* is requesting an increase in their allocation of *(Species and/or stock name)* for FSC purposes on a *(Permanent/Temporary)* basis.

**Summary of Key Criteria and Considerations for a Request in Allocation Increase (including access to previously unallocated species)**

<b>Criteria Considered</b>	<b>Key Information</b>	<b>DFO Evaluation</b>
Requested allocation of species /stock <i>(units per capita)</i>		
Existing allocation of requested species/stock <i>(units per capita)</i>		
Existing allocation of all fish species/stocks <i>(units per capita)</i>		
What are the conservation implications of requested allocation?		
How does existing allocation		

<b>Criteria Considered</b>	<b>Key Information</b>	<b>DFO Evaluation</b>
of requested species compare with other FNs in similar geographic setting in BC?		
Identify changes in Aboriginal Groups' fish needs (e.g. population, etc.)		
Was existing allocation of requested species/stock negotiated or imposed?		
Compare existing allocation (all species) with neighbouring Aboriginal groups.		
Compare existing allocation (all species) with other Aboriginal groups in similar geographic setting.		
Does requested allocation seem reasonable for FSC on a per capita basis?		
Are fish distributed among group members?		
Is there any evidence or reason to believe that fish will be sold?		
How does request compare with reported FSC catch		

<b>Criteria Considered</b>	<b>Key Information</b>	<b>DFO Evaluation</b>
data?		
If the request involves access to a previously unallocated species, is there adequate historical information to support this request?		
Will approval of the request have implications for other Aboriginal groups?		
Is the request to facilitate short-term access to unusually high stock abundance?		
Is the requesting Aboriginal group participating in the Treaty process, and if so, identify any Treaty implications.		

Recommendation and Summary of Supporting Rationale:



\\svbcvanfp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal Drives\Area Directors\RDG Office\Sharan Johal\Electronic Documents  
001\SDC - Strategic Directions Committee\14 - January 5, 2006\2 - First Nations Mandate Developments  
.doc