



**Wild Pacific Salmon Policy Forum 3
Summary Report**



**Forum held:
December 8, 2005
Burnaby, British Columbia**



**Submitted to:
Department of Fisheries and Oceans**



**Submitted by:
Norton-Arnold & Company**



**Submitted on:
December 27, 2005**

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Goal, Objectives and Principles	2
Findings of Wild Salmon Policy Forum 3: Themes and Major Points from the Discussion Groups	2
Comments on the Consultation Process and WSP Implementation	2
Comments on Strategy 1 – Standardized Monitoring of Wild Salmon Status	3
Comments on Strategy 2 – Assessment of Habitat Status	4
Comments on Strategy 3 – Identification of Ecosystem Values and Integration into Management of Pacific Salmon	6
Comments on Strategy 4 – Development and Implementation of a Strategic Planning Process for Salmon Conservation	7
Recommendations	9
Appendix A: Wild Salmon Policy Forum 3 Agenda	12
Appendix B: List of Participants	14
Appendix C: Transcripts of Breakout Session Discussions	16
Morning Breakout Sessions.....	16
Discussion of Strategy 1 – Standardized Monitoring of Wild Salmon Status & Strategy 2 – Assessment of Habitat Status.....	16
Afternoon Breakout Sessions	19
Discussion of Strategy 3 – Identification of Ecosystem Values and Integration into Management of Pacific Salmon & Strategy 4 – Development and Implementation of a Strategic Planning Process for Salmon Conservation	19

Introduction

On December 8, 2005, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) convened 60 First Nations representatives and stakeholders in Burnaby, BC to discuss implementation of Canada's *Policy for the Conservation of Wild Pacific Salmon (WSP)*. The purpose of the forum was to discuss the draft *Wild Salmon Policy Work Plan*, with the goal of identifying ways to consult and collaborate in implementing the Policy, specifically its first four strategies.

The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans released the Wild Salmon Policy in June 2005. The Policy is the foundation for the Fisheries Reform initiative in the Pacific region that the Minister announced earlier in 2005. It supports two of the initiative's four major themes:

- ♦ Sustaining strong salmon populations by setting clear conservation objectives based on the principles of the Wild Salmon Policy;
- ♦ Strengthening DFO programs that are critical to conservation, such as habitat protection, enforcement and the scientific assessment of stocks.

The December 8 forum was the third DFO has conducted to address the Wild Salmon Policy. In the first two forums First Nations representatives, stakeholders and DFO staff worked together to develop and refine the WSP, specifically the Policy's six strategies. With the third forum, the emphasis of consultation moved to examining how the WSP will be implemented and who will be involved.

In preparation for the forum the WSP Working Group developed a draft *Wild Salmon Policy Implementation Work Plan* as well as key questions to focus the forum's discussion. You will find the Work Plan in Appendix A of this report, and the discussion questions on the forum's agenda in Appendix B. Appendix C is a point-by-point record of participants' comments.

Alternating plenary sessions and small group discussions provided the forum's structure. In plenary sessions, scientists and policy analysts from the WSP Working Group presented proposed steps for implementing each of the Policy's first four strategies. The morning plenary and discussions addressed standardized monitoring of wild salmon status and assessment of habitat status; the afternoon sessions focused on inclusion of ecosystem values and integrated strategic planning. Participants discussed each of the four strategies in small facilitated groups.

This report presents the findings and themes from the plenaries and small-group discussions. Comments are arranged by strategy and grouped by theme. Please note that these comments are not statements of consensus.

The body of this report is organized as follows:

1. Goal, Objectives and Principles
2. Findings
3. Comments on the Consultation Process and the WSP
4. Themes and Comments Concerning Implementation of Strategies 1 – 4
5. Recommendations
6. Appendices

Goal, Objectives and Principles

The goal of the Wild Salmon Policy is to restore and maintain healthy and diverse salmon populations and their habitat for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of Canada in perpetuity. To achieve this goal, three objectives must be met:

- ♦ Safeguard the genetic diversity of wild Pacific salmon
- ♦ Maintain habitat and ecosystem integrity
- ♦ Manage fisheries for sustainable benefits.

All decisions and actions concerning the conservation of wild Pacific salmon in British Columbia and the Yukon will be guided by three principles:

Principle 1: Conservation of wild salmon and their habitats is the highest priority in resource management decision-making.

Principle 2: Resource management processes and decisions will honour Canada's obligations to First Nations

Principle 3: Resource management decisions will consider biological, social and economic consequences, reflect best science including Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge (ATK), and maintain the potential for future generations to meet their needs and aspirations.

Principle 4: Resource management decisions will be made in an open, transparent and inclusive manner.

Findings of Wild Salmon Policy Forum 3: Themes and Major Points from the Discussion Groups

COMMENTS ON THE CONSULTATION PROCESS AND WSP IMPLEMENTATION

Forum participants offered a number of comments generally applicable to WSP implementation. A number stressed the importance of informing and building public support for salmon restoration and conservation through communication, both by developing a communications strategy for the WSP and by conducting discussions about the Policy's implementation sub regionally throughout BC and in the Yukon. A second theme running throughout not only this forum's discussion but previous consultations was the need for adequate resources for DFO regulatory enforcement and habitat protection. A third theme expressed participants' support for continuing collaboration in policy development and implementation, specifically the recommendation to establish a continuing forum in which to review and ratify policy initiatives and implementation work plans. Support shown at Policy Forums 1 and 2 for DFO's collaborative approach to the WSP continued in the third forum. One participant, for example, said that these consultations represent "a significant shift in culture" and commented that rather than coming in with a set plan, DFO is engaging stakeholders and First Nations in developing how the Wild Salmon Policy (WSP) will be implemented. Another said, "I feel like this is a real consultative process, where what I say will be taken into account."

Specific comments on WSP implementation included:

The WSP is a new way of doing business. It's a work in progress.

DFO must have adequate resources to implement the WSP; \$700,000, divided as it is for a wide range of tasks over a wide geographic area, is inadequate.

There are many competing demands for tax dollars, and without communication, the public may decide that it doesn't want its money spent on fish. Implementing the WSP requires engaging a much broader audience. The results of the strategic planning done by Living Rivers would be useful in planning effective communication; link Living Rivers, the WSP and other initiatives. There is a "huge role" for NGOs and opportunity for partnership in communicating about the WSP's implementation. "DFO is incredibly adept at delivering bad news." The Department needs to get better at communicating positive results.

Broad support for Wild Salmon Policy implementation requires joint review and ratification. DFO should continue convening joint forums involving First Nations, NGOs, academics and other stakeholders. Implementation requires adaptive management and adaptive management requires an organizational structure.

A DFO goal is to form partnerships. A partnership means that both sides bring something to the table. DFO keeps bringing less and less. The Department is decreasing enforcement staff by 24 and habitat staff by 43. As a result, DFO is not addressing habitat problems. Not addressing these problems lessens the willingness of organizations to partner with the Department. Being responsive is essential to maintaining the support and inspiration of the groups and citizens who care about salmon.

Aquaculture should be land-based.

Follow the Alaska model for salmon management and conservation.

The WSP needs "glue to bind people to it." Stewardship programs can help build a constituency for WSP implementation. Identify the resources and research watershed stewards can bring to WSP implementation by meeting with these groups where they are, not just by convening meetings in the Lower Mainland. Implementation of the WSP should involve widespread community involvement.

The sooner DFO moves into pilot implementation of the WSP the better. Moving ahead will clarify ambiguities and all involved will learn by doing. Let's get on with it.

COMMENTS ON STRATEGY 1 – STANDARDIZED MONITORING OF WILD SALMON STATUS

Participants' comments on Strategy 1 focused on Conservation Units, particularly the perceived need to more clearly define the concept, the application and the benefits of the conservation-unit approach to salmon conservation. Participants expressed differences of opinion about what should be included in the definition of CUs.

Specific comments included:

Conservation Units

The work plan's definition of Conservation Unit is too loose (unclear) to provide sufficient guidance. DFO is presenting divergent messages on what a CU is. The definition seems to be 60% presentation and 40% content. Define the criteria for identifying CUs.

Identification of CUs has to take into account a range of factors, not just smolt production. Sophisticated map matrices are needed to ensure the CU system makes sense.

The funds allocated for monitoring wild salmon status and assessing habitat are inadequate.

Address how DFO will deal with overlap in CUs. With so much overlap, how will DFO report results? In managing CUs, how do you look at just one CU? How do you take into account connected CUs? In using geographic distribution as a criterion for defining CUs, what are the limits? Consider, for example, the wide distribution of Fraser Coho.

CUs are useful for some forms of management, but watershed-based management is more useful. Integrated planning by watersheds is more "on the ground" than planning based on CUs. Planning by watershed is a better organizing principle than planning by CU. Reconsider basing planning on CUs.

Don't overemphasize CU definition at the expense of protecting habitat. In the WSP implementation plan, DFO should specify what actions will be taken to ensure that stocks are not put at risk. Assess threats in order to prevent CUs from sliding into red status.

DFO needs to define the mechanisms by which the Department will get input into the definition of CUs. Identification of CUs and assessment of salmon status must be based on science not on social factors or people's preferences. Present and make use of existing work and data on CUs. In defining CUs, consider the ecological services salmon provide. Even small stocks help maintain broader ecosystem functions. Developing assessment criteria and operational frameworks and identifying benchmarks are essential to implementing Strategy 1.

Include cultural indicators in identifying CUs. Establishing CUs has to include local and traditional information. For example, through legends and stories First Nations people have recorded the presence of Coho and sockeye river spawners in the Thompson River system for more than 800 years. Talk with First Nations elders to locate stocks. Make use of First Nations' knowledge in recovery planning.

A First Nations' perspective on CUs: First Nations break down populations into nations, then tribes, then families and then individuals. We would never sacrifice any one individual. The same analogy applies to fish. We would never say that we have enough of one type of individual and we can ignore it – we would never do that. The CU concept seems to be a short-cut route to the management of individuals.

Involve and establish relationships with local communities in establishing CUs. Make information about CUs and habitat assessment easily accessible. Posting information on the Internet is a good place to start. Publish proposed CUs and ask if anything is missing based on scientific criteria not on interest group perspective. Strategy 1's final deliverable should be broad acceptance of CUs. Co-manage CUs with existing local groups.

COMMENTS ON STRATEGY 2 – ASSESSMENT OF HABITAT STATUS

Continuing a theme expressed during WSP forums 1 and 2, participants pointed out the necessity of greater involvement in WSP implementation of the Province and of forestry and agricultural interests. Participants see the implementation of the WSP as a highly

important opportunity (and responsibility) for DFO to protect salmon habitat. Participants called for the use in WSP implementation of previous work by government and NGOs on salmon stock and habitat status. Participants pointed out the benefits of continued and strengthened collaboration among First Nations and volunteer watershed stewards. Participants expressed a range of opinions about standardization of benchmarks to assess habitat status.

Specific comments included:

Habitat protection needs to be explicitly part of the WSP implementation plan, its tasks and its "deliverables." Salmon habitat needs protection from mining, logging and oil and gas exploration and production. For this reason, successful implementation of the WSP requires the involvement of the Province, specifically the Ministry of Forests. The WSP must address threats to habitat. Seeing DFO address threats to habitat inspires and increases the membership of organizations that care about salmon, fishing and the environment.

The Marine Conservation Caucus wants to play a role in implementing the WSP.

The work plan includes "study, measure, plan" but is light on action. Define what needs to be done differently than in the past in terms of agriculture, forestry, industry and city land-use planning. Implementation of the WSP requires that DFO identify other policies and regulations outside of DFO that affect habitat. Define and build the necessary partnerships.

Selection of indicators of habitat status is a technical process. A management structure needs to be framed around the CU. Design a management structure for a CU and then consult with the communities involved. A protocol or management agreement with the province and First Nations is needed to develop a management structure for CUs. .

In monitoring CUs and assessing habitat status make use of "Salmon Stock Status" and other previous reports. Use data from volunteer groups such as Stream Keepers. Building on partnerships and defining operational frameworks will support effective monitoring and habitat assessment.

Make clear how DFO will involve First Nations and stakeholders in defining benchmarks to represent biological status. Engage volunteers in habitat assessment. Coordinate with SEHAB, which can "get the word out" about CU identification, habitat assessment and WSP implementation. Conduct discussions on CUs and habitat status throughout the Province.

Benchmarks need to be standardized across all areas. In assessing salmon population and habitat status, use a system consistent with that used by COSEWIC.

Allow area (regions) of the province and territory to go beyond minimum standards. Each area may want benchmarks specific to that area.

Define what indicators of biological status are based on. Basing indicators on three-year-old data implies accepting reduced populations in CUs. The point is to restore salmon populations not just maintain them at reduced levels.

Agreement on habitat indicators is key. In identifying ecosystem values and habitat indicators, use examples of agencies, groups and individuals agreeing on indicators of environmental conditions. An example is the collaboration of hunters, agency scientists and NGOs concerned about the Porcupine caribou herd agreeing on indicators of climate change. SEHAB would like to be involved in identifying ecosystem values and can help DFO connect with community groups.

Scientific assessment of habitat status is needed specifically:

- Analysis of water flow regimes
- Analysis of the extent of the threat posed by sea lice associated with fish farms
- Analysis of the effects of pollution on juvenile salmon.

COMMENTS ON STRATEGY 3 – IDENTIFICATION OF ECOSYSTEM VALUES AND INTEGRATION INTO MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC SALMON

Of the four strategies under discussion, Strategy 3 engendered the greatest uncertainty among participants about DFO's ability to carry it out. A number of participants called for DFO to clarify the definition of ecosystem within the context of the WSP. Several stakeholders voiced their conviction that regulating recreational harvest and protecting and enhancing salmon habitat - not only reducing commercial harvest - need to be DFO's focus for salmon conservation in the future. There was general support for continued collaborative decision-making with First Nations and stakeholders. Some participants, however, commented that those convened as an expert panel to assist DFO in defining ecosystem values should be delegated or elected representatives. Other participants recommended constituting the panel with both community representatives and scientific experts. The point participants conveyed is: do not limit or replace consultation with First Nations and communities with consultation with experts.

Specific comments included:

Communication with the public about the value of salmon, specifically the ecosystem services they provide, is essential. The argument that DFO and others who care about salmon should make to the public should center on the environmental benefits salmon provide. We must do a better job of valuing salmon. We need to communicate that the value of salmon includes the value of cultures and languages associated for thousands of years with salmon, and the value of viewing salmon.

The conservation sector fought for the inclusion of Strategy 3 in the WSP. There is nothing more important to us. The concept supporting Strategy 3 began with the idea that the government must recognize the need to capture Canadian values in healthy ecosystems. This is the one place where we can all agree. If we want a flourishing commercial and recreational fishery, and First Nations' rights recognized, we need significant federal-provincial-municipal cooperation. The strategy's current wording has been watered down. If we lose this strategy, we lose British Columbians.

Ecosystem management seems to be an "add-on" to the implementation plan. It is not clear what ecosystem means in the context of the WSP - the whole ecosystem or just as it impacts what salmon do or need. Implementation needs to deal with salmon in ecosystems. You can't separate a "salmon ecosystem" from an overall ecosystem.

Which ecosystem approach are you proposing: What salmon mean to habitat or what habitat means to salmon?

The implementation plan doesn't look at marine conditions broadly enough – ocean conditions and climate change are just two indicators.

Further commercial harvest reduction is no longer an effective option. Recreational harvest management and habitat and ecosystem protection and enhancement need to be the focus for the future. Habitat degradation and not commercial fishing is now the primary cause of reduced numbers of salmon. Stopping fishing masks – it doesn't fix - environmental problems. The environmental problems continue until the fish are gone. Because the Province is responsible for regulating forestry, agriculture, ground water management, water withdrawals and land use planning, the Province must be involved in implementing the WSP.

Implementation needs to result in a comprehensive identification of baseline ecosystem values.

The approach outlined in Strategy 3 is reasonable, but the Expert Panel needs to clearly define environmental indicators. As a starting point, the panel needs to develop an agreed-to definition of ecosystem values and monitoring. Consider some way of having the experts elected. They shouldn't be appointed by DFO. Use specific experts as resources. Ensure that experts are broad-based and are good communicators. DFO should enable the participation of experts with limited resources.

There is the risk that Strategy 3 is too broad and will bog down the whole process of WSP implementation. Indicators have already been defined. Put more data into the existing framework. Social and cultural indicators should be included to measure progress toward reaching the policy's goals. Evaluate progress by setting goals and measuring outcomes. Defining where you want to go allows negotiation about trade-offs.

COMMENTS ON STRATEGY 4 – DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS FOR SALMON CONSERVATION

Participants asked that DFO more precisely integrate the Wild Salmon Policy and the WSP implementation work plan.

Specific comments included:

The scale at which planning is done needs to be clear – Conservation Unit, watershed, basin, coast-wide or some combination. The implementation plan needs a timeline showing when actions will happen. A longer-term plan is needed for 2-5 years. Hoped-for outcomes of integrated planning need to be clear and defined "out-front."

The management structure for integrated planning needs to be organized around objectives in specific locations with specific stocks. Set up a management structure specific to CUs. It is necessary for First Nations, the Province and DFO to reach agreement on a management structure for integrated planning.

WSP implementation needs to understand and integrate what governments, First Nations, NGOs and other agencies are doing. In implementing the WSP, integrate cultural knowledge with scientific analysis. Incorporate First Nations' knowledge of salmon

abundance in all planning mechanisms. "Science provides one type of knowledge but it can't be put above other types of knowledge." Examples of the synthesis of scientific analysis and traditional knowledge include the Millennium Assessment of Global Environmental Conditions and work done by the Commission on Sustainable Development and the World Resources Institute relating ecosystem benefits to indigenous peoples.

There are some disconnects between the WSP and the draft implementation work plan – the two need to be better integrated. In some cases using language from the WSP as preambles to work plan sections would make them more understandable; in other cases the equivalent sections of the WSP and work plan seem to be saying different things.

WSP implementation needs to take into account what worked or didn't work in the past, what is happening elsewhere, what has been studied or acted on before to avoid repeating mistakes, "reinventing the wheel," and – most important – to increase the WSP's chances of success. For example, consider making use of previously completed Watershed Fish Sustainability Planning.

The implementation strategy may be too much to accomplish within proposed timeframes – It might be better to be less ambitious to increase the chance of success.

Steps in the proposed 5-step process are out of order from the standpoint of practical effectiveness and logical implementation. Step three of the process should be first. The order should be 3, 1, 2, 4, 5. The five-step process is out of sync with sustainable management; it's the old model. The five-step process is very difficult to monitor and to report the results of.

The five-step process is a good one. The Fraser is a good place to start with a pilot of the process

Start with pilot projects in areas that are less complicated than the Fraser, for example in the Georgia Basin where a framework is already in place.

Is there a reason for separating freshwater ecosystems and ocean systems when discussing salmon ecosystems? Ocean conditions and climate change are mentioned but maybe we should include other salmon ecosystem indicators in Action Step 3.2: Integrate climate change and ocean information into annual salmon management processes.

Analyze how to integrate WSP implementation with DFO and other agencies' obligations and policies such as fisheries renewal, the Yukon Final Agreement and the National Marine Conservation Area statute.

In terms of convening the response teams for priority CUs identified in Strategy 1, because no funds have been specifically allocated for this task, constitute these teams with salaried staff from ministries and industries that can actually resolve problems and take action.

Implementation of the WSP has to respect agreements with First Nations. Include First Nations and stakeholders from the beginning of integrated planning. Integrated planning cannot be successful if done solely internally to DFO - DFO is not the sole implementer of the WSP. The Department needs to support leadership by others. Put

money into training to build capacity. Involve watershed councils. Integrate with agricultural and harvest policy. Identify competing priorities and related legislation.

We are never going back to the good old days of 70 to 80% exploitation. It just won't happen. It's even immoral. We need a new way of doing business. First Nations see the WSP as a new way of doing business. First Nations dealing with US tribes proposed the WSP. First Nations have protected the genetic diversity of those stocks in their local communities. There has to be a new way of dealing with management. This policy is not written in stone. Although we have had some discussion we see the most impact on the uppermost part of the system. If you see how we manage those aggregates – the systems are in dire need of fixing up – both habitat and more fish. We have identified what those problems are. We have identified what the environmental problems are with the lakes. We need to come together and say these are the problems and this is how we want to address them. CUs are not far apart on sockeye but far apart on Coho and we have a problem with Chinook management. WSP deals with enhancement. In the Fraser system, five to seven hatcheries were shut down and we saw the impacts of these closures. This policy needs to deal with subsidies to fisheries and the question of whose fishery it is. Since we haven't harvested Coho in the last 25 years maybe First Nations need to be the first group. The status quo is not working. The WSP gives us an ability to move forward. You get what you negotiate. Correct the problems within the policy.

Identify the competing priorities within the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) process. Do an analysis of competing processes and policies. If the WSP is driving things, then other policies must fall in line. Which one is leading? CEAA processes do not deal with community impacts. DFO also has an obligation under the Pacific Salmon Treaty. Riparian regulations, the Fisheries Act, oceans action plan, agricultural environmental plans – these all need to be integrated with WSP implementation.

First Nations need to develop watershed councils around the province. The Pacific Salmon Commission and the Fraser Panel don't conform to the governance needs of First Nations.

Stop talking about words and how words fit together and start a pilot project, and involve other resource sectors. Strategic level planning is important but talking about policies without a tangible project is just talking about words and not real examples.

Recommendations

After facilitating the forum's discussion and preparing this summary of participants' comments, we offer the following recommendations for the Wild Salmon Policy Working Group's consideration:

Make a Clearer Case for Conservation Units

Make clearer and more compelling the concept and benefits of the conservation-unit approach. Educate people about the scientific and planning benefits CUs offer. As a forum participant pointed out: Strategy 1's final outcome should be broad acceptance of CUs.

Protect Salmon Habitat: “Get the other major players to the table”

Because the Province is responsible for regulating forestry, agriculture, ground water management, water withdrawals and land use planning, the Province must be involved

in implementing the WSP. Working to secure the future of Pacific salmon without the direct involvement of Provincial agencies and forestry and agricultural interests is fighting with one hand tied behind your back. Reaching the WSP's goals requires the participation of these interests. They are conspicuous by their absence at all the WSP forums and dialogue sessions.

In addition, DFO's acting to protect salmon habitat inspires and builds membership in the Department's natural constituency - people who actively care about the future of Pacific salmon in BC and the Yukon.

Build a Constituency for Wild Salmon Policy Implementation through Communication and Education

As forum participants pointed out, there are many competing demands for tax dollars, and without communication and education, the public may decide that it doesn't want its money spent on salmon conservation. Implementing the WSP requires engaging a broader audience. There is an important role for NGOs and opportunity for partnership in communication in support of WSP implementation. As a forum participant recommended, DFO should convene a workshop that brings together skilful communicators from First Nations, DFO, NGOs, the Province, industry and others to work out a communications strategy concerning wild salmon that isn't only government-oriented. As Dr. Robert Lackey points out, education of the public will play a crucial role in determining the future of wild Pacific salmon.

Build Partnerships

Take advantage of the specific offers of cooperation expressed in the forum and of the resources and networks First Nations and NGOs offer for salmon conservation. Examples from the December 8, 2005 forum include:

- Representative of both Simon Fraser University and the University of British Columbia offered to assist DFO as "honest brokers" of scientific information and as conveners of discussions about what to do with scientific information.
- "In the Nass we have a partnership with DFO and we have a history of doing this work. The Policy is getting stronger every time we have one of these forums."
- A representative of SEHAB pointed out that the membership of SEHAB is connected to geographic areas throughout the province and could partner with DFO in getting the word out about the WSP.
- A Streamkeepers' representative noted that Streamkeepers could provide monitoring data for DFO use in habitat assessment.
- A Marine Conservation Caucus member said the Caucus is willing to play a role in reacting to threats to habitat and to share data.
- A representative of the Pacific Salmon Foundation reported that his organization has entered into a five-year agreement with DFO to support the Foundation's Community Salmon Program. He also reported indirect support of watershed restoration projects through the Pacific Salmon Endowment Fund.

- A forum participant said that those involved in developing the Living Rivers Strategy could partner with DFO to develop a communications strategy for the WSP.

Continue Consultations

The development, through extensive consultation with First Nations and stakeholders, of the WSP and its work plan represents "a significant shift in culture," "a new way of doing business." Because this approach is broadly supported by First Nations and stakeholders, continuing this collaboration will foster the understanding and acceptance necessary for the Policy's successful implementation.

Take Advantage of Previous and Current Work by NGOs and other Agencies

In implementing the WSP's strategies, evaluate and, where warranted, use data in sources such as surveys of salmon stock status as well as data collected by volunteer conservation organizations.

Move Forward with Implementation

The initiative DFO is demonstrating in moving expeditiously from developing the WSP to implementation is strengthening the Policy's constituency. As one participant said: The sooner DFO moves into pilot implementation of the WSP the better. Moving ahead will clarify ambiguities and all involved will learn by doing. "Let's get on with it."

Appendix A: Wild Salmon Policy Forum 3 Agenda



WSP Implementation

December 8, 2005

Purpose: Discuss the draft work plan for implementing the Wild Salmon Policy (WSP). Identify ways to consult and collaborate in implementing the policy.

08:30 Registration

09:00 Welcome and opening remarks

Paul MacGillivray, DFO Associate Regional Director General

09:10 Agenda, Groundrules and Introductions

Todd Peterson, Facilitator

09:20 Review of WSP Development and Work Plan for Implementation

Mark Saunders, DFO WSP Coordinator

09:40 Review of Strategy 1: Standardized Monitoring of Wild Salmon Status

Jim Irvine, DFO Science

10:00 Review of Strategy 2: Assessment of Habitat Status

Gary Taccogna, DFO Oceans, Habitat and Enhancement Branch

10:20 Break

10:30 Strategies 1&2- Breakout Sessions (see questions below)

- What alternate approaches to implementing these strategies should we consider?
- What risks, if any, do you see to the successful implementation of these strategies?
- What role could you or the organization you represent play in implementing these strategies?
- What areas of synergy or overlap do you see between the implementation of these strategies and other initiatives?
- How could the groups represented here effectively share data and information?

12:00 Strategies 1&2 Plenary/Report Back

12:30 Lunch

1:15 Review of Strategy 3: Inclusion of Ecosystem Values and Monitoring

Brian Riddell, DFO Science

Review of Strategy 4: Integrated Strategic Planning

Mark Saunders, DFO Policy Branch

1:45 Strategy 3&4 Breakout Sessions (See discussion questions above)



- 3:00 Break
- 3:15 Strategy 3&4 Plenary/Report Back
- 4:00 Summary and Next Steps
Mark Saunders, DFO Policy Branch
- 4:20 Closing Remarks
Paul MacGillivray, DFO Association Regional Director General
- 4:30 Adjourn

Appendix B: List of Participants

Representative Invited	Organization	Attended	R-NR
Atkinson, Mary-Sue	(PFRCC)	Yes	Registered
Barnes, Chris	Gitskan Watershed Authority	Yes	Registered
Bos, Christopher	(SFAB/BCWF)	Yes	Registered
Bourgeois, Bill	New Direction Resource Mgmt. Lt.	Yes	Registered
Bratty, Jessica	(FBC)	Yes	Registered
Brockley, John	(SFAB)	Yes	Registered
Ciruna, Kristy	(NCC)	Yes	Registered
Crawford, Marie	(UBCM)	Yes	Registered
Day, Andrew	Replacing Don Hall	No	Registered
Dobell, Rod	(UVic)	Yes	Registered
Duiven, Mark	Skeena Fisheries Comm.	No	Registered
Duncan, Bill	Native Fishing Association	Yes	Registered
Egan Daryl	(AHC advisor)	Yes	Registered
Fortier Fred	(FRAFS)	Yes	Registered
Glavin, Terry	(Sierra Club)	Yes	Registered
Golds Elaine	(Birk Mtn Naturalists)	Yes	Registered
Gray, Tom	Area F Troll Advisor	Yes	Registered
Harry, Richard	Aboriginal Aquaculture Association	yes	Registered
Hodge, Tony		Yes	
Husband, Vicky	(Sierra Club)	Yes	Registered
Isbell, Penny	Business All for Local Living Economies	Yes	Registered
Jones, Sebastion	Yukon River Commercial Fishing Assoc.	Yes	registered
Kenney, Allan	PSF	Yes	Registered
Lane, David	(T. Buck Suzuki)	Yes	Registered
Langer, Otto	DSF	Yes	Registered
LeBlond, Paul	(PFRCC)	Yes	Registered
Lill, Alan	BC Conservation Foundation	Yes	Registered
Loehndorf, Jacquie	(Chilliwack SS)	Yes	Registered
Lowen, Don	SEHAB	Yes	Registered
Marliave, Jeff	(Vancouver Aquarium)	Yes	Registered
McCarthy, Brett	Chilliwack SS	Yes	Registered
Macgillivray, Paul	DFO	Yes	Registered
McKay, Craig	Laxgaltsap Village Government	Yes	Registered
Malloway, Ken	BCAFC	No	
Minard, Jack	(SEHAB)	Yes	Registered
Mirau, Garth	(UFAWU)	Yes	Registered
Morley, Rob	(CSAB)	Yes	Registered
Morten, ZoAnn	(PSKF)	Yes	Registered
Mulhall, Courtney	(Chilliwack SS)	Yes	Registered
Murphy, Marilyn	(SFAB)	No	Registered
Narcisse, Arnie	BCAFC	Yes	Registered
Newman, Edwin	BCAFC	Yes	Registered
Newsom, Rick	Area F Troller	Yes	Registered

Representative Invited	Organization	Attended	R-NR
Orr, Craig	Watershed Watch Salmon Society	Yes	Registered
Otway, Bill	(SFDL)	Yes	Registered
Parker, Pamela	BC Pacific Salmon Forum	Yes	Registered
Pinkerton, Evelyn	(SFU)	Yes	Registered
Protti, Dana	(Steelhead Society of BC)	Yes	Registered
Ramage, Diane	(PSF)	Yes	Registered
Reynolds, John	Salmon Conservation	Yes	Registered
Russ, Gary	Council of Haida Nation	Yes	Registered
Scherer, Rob	Replacing Forrex const. Chris Holsteadt	Yes	Registered
Temple, Nicola	(MCC)	No	Registered
Thorkeison, Jay	(CSAB)	Yes	Registered
Tomascik, Tomas	(Parks Canada)	No	Registered
Williams, Connie	(Chilliwack SS)	Yes	Registered
Workman, Linaya	(Transboundary Panel)	Yes	sub hotel
Young, Jeffery	David Suzuki Foundation	Yes	Registered
Yua, Lilia	(Chilliwack SS)	Yes	Registered

Representative Invited	Organization	R-NR
Bertrand, Ron	B.C. Agriculture Council	Not registered
Hope, Chief Robert		Not registered
John, Chief Ronald		Not registered
Matheson, Mack	CSAB	Not registered
Nyce, Chief Harry	Nisga'a Lisims Government	Not registered
Twaddle, Charlie	Ministry of Environment replacing W. Saito	Not registered
Wareham, Bill	David Suzuki Foundation	Not registered
Webster, Andrew		Not registered
Wilson, Greg	B.C. Ministry of Environment	Not registered

DFO
Hartling, Jay
Irving, Jim
Macgillivray, Paul
Park, Elan
Paterson, Maureen
Riddell, Brian
Saunders, Mark
Taccogna, Gary

Norton-Arnold & Company
Peterson, Todd
Rapp, Jim
Hoffman, Chris

Appendix C: Transcripts of Breakout Session Discussions

MORNING BREAKOUT SESSION

DISCUSSION OF STRATEGY 1 – STANDARDIZED MONITORING OF WILD SALMON STATUS & STRATEGY 2 – ASSESSMENT OF HABITAT STATUS

Red Group Comments

- ♦ Broad support for Wild Salmon Policy implementation requires joint review and ratification. DFO should continue convening joint forums involving NGOs, academics and others. Implementation requires adaptive management and adaptive management requires an organizational structure.
- ♦ Include habitat potential (potential productivity) in assessing habitat status.
- ♦ Consider historical data about habitat status
- ♦ Assess threats in order to prevent CUs from sliding into Red status. In the WSP implementation plan, DFO should specify what actions will be taken to ensure that stocks are not put at risk. The implementation plan must specify what will be done to "turn around" CUs.
- ♦ Remember what you monitor determines what you find.
- ♦ The work plan's definition of Conservation Unit is too loose to provide sufficient guidance.
- ♦ In monitoring CUs and assessing habitat status make use of "Salmon Stock Status" and other previous reports. Use data from volunteer groups such as Stream Keepers.
- ♦ In monitoring salmon status, take into account the Canada-U.S. salmon treaty. For reasons such as this, monitoring Fraser sockeye is the most complicated.
- ♦ Socio-economic considerations should not be part of environmental assessment of wild salmon status.
- ♦ In monitoring wild salmon status use examples of actual CUs such as Broughton pinks. Focus on the long-term threats to CUs. For example, with Broughton pinks, 97% of the fish came back to only two rivers both of which have engineered spawning channels. In monitoring salmon status and assessing habitat, distinguish between enhanced and wild systems.
- ♦ Don't overemphasize CU definition at the expense of protecting habitat.
- ♦ In using geographic distribution as a criterion for defining CUs, what are the limits? For example, consider the extensive distribution of Fraser Coho.
- ♦ In allocating resources for monitoring salmon status and habitat assessment, don't let a disproportionate share of resources "get swallowed up" by activities in the Fraser. \$400,000 for the Fraser leaves an unfair allocation for the other areas of B.C. and the Yukon.
- ♦ The funds allocated for monitoring wild salmon status and assessing habitat are inadequate.
- ♦ Salmon habitat needs protection from mining, logging and oil and gas production.
- ♦ Successful implementation of the WSP requires the involvement of the Province, specifically the Ministry of Forest and Range.
- ♦ Consider the ecological services salmon provide in defining CUs. Even small stocks help maintain broader ecosystem functions.

- ♦ Building on partnerships and defining operational frameworks will support effective monitoring and habitat assessment. Developing assessment criteria and operational frameworks and identifying benchmarks are essential to implementing Strategy 1.
- ♦ Engage volunteers in habitat assessment. Coordinate with SEHAB, which can "get the word out" about CU identification, habitat assessment and WSP implementation.
- ♦ Create "feedback loops" to streamline communication about WSP implementation.
- ♦ Strategy 1's final deliverable should be broad acceptance of CUs.
- ♦ A DFO goal is to form partnerships. A partnership means that both sides bring something to the table. DFO keeps bringing less and less. The Department is decreasing enforcement staff by 24 and habitat staff by 43. As a result, DFO is not addressing habitat problems. Not addressing these problems lessens the willingness of organizations to partner with the Department. Being responsive is essential to maintaining the support and inspiration of the groups and citizens who care about salmon.
- ♦ Make clear how DFO will involve First Nations and stakeholders in defining benchmarks to represent biological status.
- ♦ Conduct discussions on CUs and habitat status throughout the Province.

Green Group Comments

- ♦ Follow the Alaska model for salmon conservation.
- ♦ Habitat degradation and not commercial fishing is now the cause of reduced numbers of salmon. In terms of the role the various parties can play, "it will all end up on the heads of commercial fishermen – the WSP won't change that."
- ♦ The definition of Conservation Unit is unclear. Address how DFO will deal with overlap in CUs. With so much overlap, how will DFO report results?
- ♦ There is no such thing as "enough" of a species, stock, etc.
- ♦ CUs are useful for some forms of management, but watershed-based management is more useful.
- ♦ DFO is presenting divergent messages on what a CU is. The definition seems to be 60% presentation and 40% content.
- ♦ Implementation tasks have to be done sequentially not concurrently as the timeline indicates. The tasks don't link well. Task "deliverables" in a following task seem to be necessary for a preceding task. Sophisticated map matrices are needed to make the CU system makes sense.
- ♦ The proposed schedule for implementation does not allow enough time.
- ♦ WSP implementation needs to address current threats and future trends.
- ♦ The work plan for WSP implementation needs to include regulatory tools including enforcement.
- ♦ Implementation of the WSP requires that DFO identify other policies and regulations outside of DFO that bear on habitat.
- ♦ The work plan includes "study, measure, plan" but is light on action. Define what needs to be done differently than in the past in terms of agriculture, forestry, industry and city land-use planning. Define the necessary partnerships. The policy needs to recognize partnerships with other land users (timber production, urban development) who may not much like DFO and fish. But implementation requires building partnerships while DFO is trying to do more with less.
- ♦ Habitat protection needs to be explicitly part of the plan, its tasks and its "deliverables."
- ♦ The implementation plan needs to specify who to call when there are problems.

- ♦ The sooner DFO moves into pilot implementation, the better. Moving ahead will clarify ambiguities and all involved will learn by doing.
- ♦ Habitat assessment is very complex and expensive. DFO doesn't know what it's getting into.
- ♦ How will priorities for habitat assessment be set?
- ♦ The effects on salmon of harvesting other parts of the food chain need to be addressed.
- ♦ Let's get on with it.
- ♦ A neutral body is needed to review and monitor WSP implementation. The UBC Fisheries Center and SFU could serve as "honest brokers."

Blue Group Comments

- ♦ DFO needs to define the mechanisms by which the Department will get input into the definition of CUs.
- ♦ Co-manage CUs with existing local groups.
- ♦ Will results of identification and assessment of CUs be used to shut down fisheries?
- ♦ Determine how streams with limited stocks will be managed.
- ♦ Identification of CUs and assessment of salmon status must be based on science not on social factors or people's preferences. Publish proposed CUs and ask if anything is missing based on scientific criteria not on interest group perspective. Where are the criteria for identifying CUs? Identification of CUs has to take into account a range of factors, not just (smolt) production.
- ♦ Incorporate First Nations' knowledge of salmon abundance in all planning mechanisms. Science provides one type of knowledge but it can't be put above other types of knowledge. Include cultural indicators in identifying CUs.
- ♦ Establishing CUs has to include local and traditional information. Involve and establish relationships with local communities in establishing CUs.
- ♦ Use the Checamus River as a template for how to build up a river that has good habitat, significant threats and runs of coho, chum and pink salmon as well as steelhead.
- ♦ Present and make use of existing work and data on CUs.
- ♦ Make use of the Alaska model of salmon conservation.
- ♦ Benchmarks need to be standardized across all areas. In assessing salmon population status, use a system consistent with that used by COSEWIC.
- ♦ Go beyond minimum standards. Each region may seek to include benchmarks specific to that region.
- ♦ There are serious problems with salmon "all over the place." DFO can't concentrate on just one or two areas. Salmon conservation requires tracking long-term trends. What will DFO use to make decisions if not benchmarks?
- ♦ In assessing habitat status in the Broughton Archipelago, evaluate more than just a few streams.
- ♦ What are indicators of biological status based on? Basing indicators on three-year-old data implies accepting reduced populations in CUs. The point is to restore salmon populations not just maintain them at reduced levels.
- ♦ In assessing status of CUs and associated habitat and in deciding what actions to take, we need to know what we had before and what we have now.
- ♦ In terms of the Yukon Final Agreement, DFO is obligated to seek and incorporate local input.
- ♦ Make information about CUs and habitat assessment accessible. Posting information on the Internet is a good place to start.
- ♦ The WSP "needs glue to bind people to it." Stewardship programs can help build a constituency for WSP implementation.

- ♦ DFO is not the sole implementer of the WSP. The Department needs to support leadership roles for others. Put money into training to build capacity.
- ♦ Address threats to habitat. Seeing DFO address threats to habitat inspires and increases the membership of organizations that care about salmon, fishing and the environment. The Marine Conservation Caucus wants to play a role in implementing the WSP.
- ♦ Non-compliance and fish farming pose risks to the successful implementation of the WSP.
- ♦ Actively communicate, for example by staffing conservation stations on docks, what people are doing to implement the WSP and conserve wild salmon.

AFTERNOON BREAKOUT SESSIONS

DISCUSSION OF STRATEGY 3 – IDENTIFICATION OF ECOSYSTEM VALUES AND INTEGRATION INTO MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC SALMON & STRATEGY 4 – DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS FOR SALMON CONSERVATION

Red Group Comments

- ♦ What's missing from the work plan is how identification of ecosystem values is going to be used to inform planning.
- ♦ Communication with the public about the value of salmon, specifically the ecosystem services they provide, is essential. "This is the one place where we have a winner." The argument that DFO and those who care about salmon should make to the public should center on the environmental benefits salmon provide. We must do a better job of valuing salmon. We need to communicate that the value of salmon includes the value of cultures and languages associated for thousands of years with salmon, and the value of viewing salmon.
- ♦ Conduct a forum to develop a communication strategy. There is a "huge role" for NGOs and opportunity for partnership in communicating about implementing the Wild Salmon Policy.
- ♦ In identifying ecosystem values related to salmon, include the perspectives of ornithologists and terrestrial biologists and others. Salmon are important for birds, terrestrial species, for ecosystems.
- ♦ In identifying ecosystem values, acknowledge the contribution of estuaries to sustaining salmon.
- ♦ Agreement on habitat indicators is key. In identifying ecosystem values and habitat indicators, use examples of agencies, groups and individuals agreeing on indicators of environmental conditions. An example is the collaboration of hunters, agency scientists and NGOs concerned about the Porcupine caribou herd agreeing on indicators of climate change. SEHAB would like to be involved in identifying ecosystem values and could help DFO connect with community groups.
- ♦ There are many competing demands for tax dollars, and without communication the public may decide that it doesn't want its money spent on fish. Implementing the WSP requires engaging a much broader audience. The results of the strategic planning done by Living Rivers would be useful in planning effective communication. Link Living Rivers, the WSP and other initiatives.
- ♦ "The Department is incredibly adept at delivering catastrophic and bad news." It needs to get better at communicating positive results.

- ♦ Strategic planning to reverse declining trends must entail actions, not just the identification and monitoring of trends. DFO must define what it's going to do when a problem is identified.
- ♦ The management structure for integrated planning needs to be organized around objectives in specific locations with specific stocks. Set up a management structure specific to CUs. It is necessary for First Nations, the Province and DFO to reach agreement on a management structure for integrated planning.
- ♦ In identifying ecosystem values, make use of the information developed by watershed groups. Meet with watershed groups "where they are" and identify the resources they have. Then DFO can determine "where the holes are."
- ♦ Stopping fishing masks - it doesn't fix – environmental problems. The environmental problems continue until the fish are gone. For this reason the cooperation and contribution of the Province are essential.

Green Group Comments

- ♦ The five-step process is out of sync with sustainable management; it's the old model. The five-step process is very difficult to monitor and to report the results of.
- ♦ Ecosystem management seems to be an "add-on" to the implementation plan. Implementation needs to deal with salmon in ecosystems. You can't separate a "salmon ecosystem" from an overall ecosystem. Which ecosystem approach are you proposing: What salmon mean to habitat or what habitat means to salmon?
- ♦ The implementation plan doesn't look at marine conditions broadly enough – ocean conditions and climate change are just two indicators.
- ♦ There seem to be "disconnects" between the WSP and how the draft work plan goes about implementation.
- ♦ Implementation needs to integrate with what other agencies and sectors are doing.
- ♦ Initially at least, WSP implementation needs to be simplified to assure that something is accomplished.
- ♦ The 3.2 matrix is missing from the document.
- ♦ The implementation plan needs a timeline showing when actions will happen. A longer-term plan is needed for 2-5-? years.
- ♦ Implementation needs to result in comprehensive identification of baseline values.
- ♦ How is this implementation plan going to work when commercial fisheries are the only sector limited in catch?
- ♦ To what extent has all the research and study that went before WSP being used to inform and implement the plan?
- ♦ At what scale will integrated planning be done - CU, watershed, coast wide...?
- ♦ Make clear the outcomes of the integrated planning process.

Blue Group Comments

- ♦ The approach outlined in Strategy 3 is reasonable, but the Expert Panel needs to clearly define environmental indicators.
- ♦ Consider some way of having the experts elected. They shouldn't be appointed by DFO. Use specific experts as resources. Ensure that experts are broad-based and are good communicators. DFO should enable the participation of experts with limited resources.
- ♦ Bring information into the process of identifying ecosystem values and in return communicate widely.

- ♦ Guard against allowing the strategy to become too complicated. Determine how many fish die and decay and thereby provide nutrients to an ecosystem.
- ♦ There is the risk that Strategy 3 is too broad and will bog down the whole process of WSP implementation. Indicators have already been defined. Put more data into the existing framework. Social and cultural indicators should be included to measure progress toward reaching the policy's goals. Evaluate progress by setting goals and measuring outcomes. Defining where you want to go allows negotiation about trade-offs.
- ♦ We need to realize the limits of what we can change and control.
- ♦ Defining the ecosystem principles we accept will guide how implementation proceeds.
- ♦ In managing CUs, how do you look at just one CU? How do you take into account connected CUs?
- ♦ The five-step process is a good one. The Fraser is a good place to start with a pilot of the process.
- ♦ Management options are too limited; they're limited to harvest.
- ♦ In terms of 4.1.2, don't just focus on red CUs. Their red status may be the result of causes beyond our control. Focus on protecting healthy CUs.
- ♦ It's not clear that some weak stocks will recover.
- ♦ Forestry has to be part of planning for salmon conservation.
- ♦ Implementation can't focus just on the easiest options.
- ♦ Step three of the five-step planning procedure should be first. The order should be 3, 1, 2, 4, 5.
- ♦ The WSP is a new way of doing business. It's a work in progress.
- ♦ The WSP implementation plan should deal with the issue of enhancement. Assess the effect of hatcheries on the five-step process.
- ♦ Include First Nations and stakeholders from the beginning of integrated planning. Integrated planning cannot be successfully done internally to DFO. Involve watershed councils. Integrate with agricultural and harvest policy. Identify competing priorities and related legislation. The SEA process does not conform to the WSP.
- ♦ Analyze how to integrate WSP implementation with DFO's other obligations such as fisheries renewal, the Yukon Final Agreement, the National Marine Conservation Area statute.
- ♦ Implementation of the WSP has to respect agreements with First Nations.
- ♦ Integrated planning by watersheds is more "on the ground" than planning based on CUs. Planning by watershed is a better organizing principle than planning by CU. Reconsider basing planning on CUs.
- ♦ There is no one-size-fits-all approach for implementing the WSP. Make use of good working examples of integrated planning and implementation. DFO doesn't need to wait for the Fraser River pilot program to be completed. Don't put all the implementation "eggs in one basket."