

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE

Heather Stalberg

Senior SARA Biologist, DFO Oceans, Habitat and Enhancement

17 November 2010

The role of the WSP Habitat Working Group and WSP Habitat Coordinator

- Ms. Stalberg will explain her contribution to the implementation of Strategy 2 of the Wild Salmon Policy (WSP) from November 2005 to January 2009.
- With reference to page 35 of the WSP, she does not recall a document being developed for long-term implementation planning. However, she recalls Mark Saunders generated a plan early in the program based on the Risk Management and Accountability Framework, and Amy Mar developed a GANTT workplan reflecting all the strategies was developed for the Implementation Team.
- She will say that she was the WSP Habitat Strategy Coordinator from July 2006 to January 2009 as well as being a member of the WSP Implementation Team from November 2005 to January 2009. She will say that the OHEB Regional Director Rebecca Reid had planned to sunset this position in March 2009. She has had some limited engagement on the WSP since then.
- She will describe the role, actions and membership of the WSP Habitat Working Group.
- She will say that she has not been contacted in relation to Strategy 6 in recent months.

Strategy 2 implementation in general

- Ms. Stalberg will give her view on Strategy 2's role in the conservation of Pacific salmon.
- She will say that the four action steps within Strategy 2 should be developed concurrently as each informs the other. She will say that the WSP Habitat Working Group Work worked concurrently on all four Action Steps of Strategy 2.
- Ms Stalberg can provide the background on why Gary Taccogna generated the report *The Wild Salmon Policy* Habitat Strategy Discussion Paper (CAN001124).
- She will say that the Strategies in the WSP are interrelated and not autonomous. She will say that Strategies 1-3 should generally precede the implementation of Strategy 4. However she will also say that this should not preclude early planning for the implementation of Strategy 4, including by considering how CU habitat status may influence fishery decisions and how CU status may influence habitat decisions.
- In that respect, she will say that she generated an information piece for the Fraser River Sockeye Spawning Initiative (FRSSI) in 2007 regarding how habitat status could be incorporated into FRSSI.
- She will say that the WSP Habitat Working Group was not engaged in aquaculture issues. She will say that DFO's work on developing habitat status indicators and benchmarks under Step 2.2 had not yet included nearshore or marine indicators. She will say that members of the WSP Implementation Team later determined that marine indicators would be developed through Strategy 3. She will say that it will have to be seen as to their ability to track aquaculture.

- She will say that the question of how the WSP would relate to aquaculture came up in WSP consultations, and that her response was consistent with the aquaculture sidebar on page 36 of the WSP.

Action Step 2.1

- Ms. Stalberg will explain that a two tier approach to characterizing habitat was determined whereby there would be Overview reports for each CU and a habitat status report for priority CUs.
- Ms. Stalberg will explain habitat status reports under Action Step 2.1. She will say that habitat status reports are intended to characterize the habitat status for a CU, including by identifying habitats of high value, known limiting factors, and restoration and conservation measures to enhance and protect the productivity of the CU.
- She will say that she contributed to the development of the template for habitat status reports, in consultation with members of the WSP Implementation team and stock assessment staff.
- She can describe the contents and structure of habitat status reports. If asked, she can do so with reference to Appendix 2 of *Canada's Policy for Conservation of Wild Pacific Salmon: Stream, Lake and Estuarine Habitat Indicators* ("the WSP Habitat Indicators Paper") (CAN019252) or with reference to Slide 12 of her September 23, 2008 presentation to the Operations Committee (CAN018434).
- With reference to Slide 21 of her September 23, 2008 presentation, she will say that, as of March 2009, the only Fraser River sockeye CUs that she believed to have partial habitat status reports were Trembleur Lake sockeye and Cultus Lake sockeye.
- She was involved in developing the Trembleur Lake sockeye partial habitat status report, one of nine CUs where partial habitat status reports were being piloted.
- She will bring any Cultus Lake sockeye partial habitat status report to the hearing.
- With reference to the habitat status reports for the Harrison River Watershed CUs (CAN185605), which include three separate Fraser River sockeye CUs, she was not aware of these as of March 2009. However, she will say that these tables are consistent with the intended model for habitat status reports and are a positive step.
- She will say that habitat status reports can still be partially filled-in where indicators and benchmarks are not finished, and can be filled-in further as more information is learned.

Action Step 2.2

- Ms. Stalberg will describe DFO's work under Action Step 2.2 of Strategy 2.
- She will summarize the concepts of habitat indicators and their metrics and benchmarks.
- She will say that the WSP Habitat Indicators Paper documents the development of the WSP habitat indicators under Strategy 2.
- If asked, she can comment generally on the PFRCC Advisory on Implementing the Habitat and Ecosystem Components of DFO's Wild Salmon policy, including the cover letter to the Ministers dated September 29, 2006 (CAN000449).
- If asked, she can comment generally on the PFRCC report entitled *Selection and Use of Indicators to Measure the Habitat Status of Wild Pacific Salmon* (CAN045985).
- She will say that she contracted ESSA to write the report *Refining habitat indicators for Strategy 2 of the Wild Salmon Policy: Practical assessment of indicators* (CAN019235). She also contracted ESSA to write a subsequent report regarding metrics and benchmarks for these habitat indicators.

- She will say that the PFRCC *Selection and Use of Indicators to Measure the Habitat Status of Wild Pacific Salmon* (CAN045985) and ESSA reports were good, well-considered reports that informed the WSP Habitat Working Group's development of WSP habitat indicators.
- She will explain that the WSP Habitat Working Group was asked to develop the suite of possible indicators under Strategy 2, but was not given any budget threshold. The Working Group tried to develop indicators that were informative and practical, and that could later be used by First Nations and various stakeholders such as industry, the Province or stewardship groups.
- She will say that Gary Taccogna, through research and consultations with other agencies, initially recommended the use of the pressure/state model for indicators under Step 2.2.
- If asked, she can describe the nature and use of the pressure/state model and indicators.
- She will say that the WSP Habitat Working Group reviewed indicators used by other jurisdictions and considered cost effectiveness in the selection process.
- She will say that DFO's habitat indicators should be understood as a pool of indicators to be chosen from depending on the species, CU and watershed-specific considerations.
- She will explain that the WSP Habitat Indicators Paper does not provide a benchmark for every indicator as this was not always possible. For some indicators, the paper provides a provisional, precautionary benchmark. For some indicators, where information is not known to define this kind of benchmark, interpretation of relative rankings was recommended.
- She will clarify that the metrics and benchmarks for DFO's WSP habitat indicators have not been finalized. The WSP Habitat Working Group agreed to its desired metrics and benchmarks, which are summarized in her September 23, 2008 presentation (CAN018434). However, at the January 2009 peer review, some participants felt that there needed to be more discussion before metrics and benchmarks were finalized.
- She will say that the WSP Habitat Indicators Paper did not include nearshore or marine habitat indicators because the Habitat Working Group had yet to evaluate these, and that lake, stream and estuary indicators was a full workload to start. She will say that Science later agreed to develop nearshore and marine habitat indicators as part of Strategy 3.
- She will say Dr. Jim Irvine presented at the peer review of the Habitat Indicators Paper that Strategy 3 would incorporate biotic indicators such as invertebrates.
- She will say that the WSP Habitat Indicators Paper was not peer reviewed by CSAS, which was then PSARC. She and her managers decided against a CSAS review because it would be limited to approval, approval with changes, or rejection. They were concerned that CSAS might reject or discount parts of the paper that might be outside the realm of science such as the practical analysis of the costs and accessibility of different habitat indicators.
- She may be asked to comment on the peer review proceedings (CAN019256), including the Summary and Introduction.

Action Step 2.3

- Ms. Stalberg will say that, to her knowledge, DFO is not monitoring or assessing CU habitat status under Step 2.3 using the WSP Habitat Indicators under Step 2.2.

- She does not believe that DFO is actively conducting monitoring under Step 2.3.
- She will say that, if DFO wished to commence monitoring and assessing CU habitat status under Step 2.3, using the WSP Habitat Indicators, it could do so.
- However, she will also say that, before beginning to monitor and assess CU habitat status under Step 2.3, DFO and others would benefit by first creating a monitoring framework to help guide monitoring efforts.
- She will agree that WSP Strategy 2 is not explicit in requiring any monitoring framework. She will agree that no intermediate step is required between Steps 2.2 and 2.3.
- In discussing a monitoring framework, she may refer to her briefing note entitled “WSP Strategy 2 Monitoring Framework” (CAN185600), which captures the deliberations of the WSP Implementation Team and Carol Cross. She may be asked about the statement that “collection and monitoring of environmental habitat status indicator information is not a mandate of the National Fish Habitat Management program”.
- She will be asked about the final paragraph at page 4 of the letter sent by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to the David Suzuki Foundation on April 24, 2007 (CAN055648). She will say that it is possible that she was consulted on a draft of the letter, as the WSP Habitat Strategy Coordinator, but does not specifically recall being consulted on it.
- She will say that Step 2.3 habitat monitoring cannot be done by DFO alone; partners will be needed.

Action Step 2.4

- Ms. Stalberg will describe the WSP web-mapping application that was developed as an integrated data system under Action Step 2.4. This was developed by GIS staff within OHEB that were on the WSP Habitat Working Group
- She will describe the purposes of the WSP web-mapping application, the types of information that could be layered into the database, and its potential functions and utility.
- She will say that, to her knowledge, the WSP web-mapping application is being maintained internally by OHEB GIS staff as it has been since its inception.
- She will say that, to her knowledge, the WSP web-mapping application was launched internally and externally in April 2009.
- She will say that she understands that the WSP web-mapping application was initiated by Gary Taccogna with OHEB GIS staff. She later assumed oversight of its development.
- She will say that OHEB funded the initial development of the WSP web-mapping application and that DFO’s GIS capacity is situated within OHEB.
- She will say that the Habitat Working Group and the WSP Implementation Team were consulted extensively in the development of the WSP web-mapping application.
- She will say that the WSP web-mapping application is intended to serve all of the WSP Strategies. For example, she hired a contractor to enter the Strategy 1 CU boundaries into the WSP web-mapping application and the contractor worked with Dr. Blair Holtby at Science.
- She will say that annual funding support of the web-mapping application development had been committed to by all branches.
- She will say that the Operations Committee received a request for long-term funding from multiple sectors for technical support of the web-mapping application at its September 23, 2008 meeting (CAN018434).
- She will say that she and the WSP Implementation Team reviewed the October 8, 2008 RMC Decision Paper entitled “Wild Salmon Policy (WSP) Web Mapping Application”

(CAN005559). She will say that WSP Implementation Team members were asked to brief their managers before the October 14, 2008 meeting.

- She will say that she and Dwight McCullough demonstrated the web-mapping application and Rebecca Reid explained the three-year funding request to the RMC on the WSP web-mapping application on October 14, 2008.
- She will provide her recollections of the RMC discussion and decision not to approve the funding, with reference to the RMC Record of Decision (CAN006233). She recalls Laura Richards wanting to put the request into context of what all the WSP multi-branch related requests for support might be and Paul Macgillivray asking why the request was being made now.
- She will be asked if she was surprised that the funding request was not approved.
- She does not recall if Policy coordinated the joint response to the RMC's direction.
- She does not know what was presented to the Operations Committee on January 8, 2009, where members confirmed they would not commit to multi-year funding for enhancing technical support of the application (CAN115859).
- She will say that Ms. Reid later advised her that OHEB would continue to support the web-mapping application through \$2K-\$3K funding per year for maintenance. As well, Ms. Reid advised her that a quarter or third of a Person Year would be dedicated to WSP by OHEB, after her position sunset.

Challenges with implementing Strategy 2

- Ms. Stalberg will say that, in her last year on the WSP file, she put substantial effort into examining and advising on options for the integration of WSP into the OHEB program.
- She will say that she initially developed a workplan GANTT chart that detailed the tasks for implementation of Strategy 2.
- She will say she had meetings with OHEB managers over the summer and fall of 2008 to determine what elements of the workplan could be integrated into OHEB, within their existing capacity.
- Following these meetings, she provided a briefing note with recommendations to then Habitat Protection and Sustainable Development Regional Manager Bruce Reid and other managers on the essential elements that the Areas and the Region should pursue in implementing Strategy 2. She can explain her recommendations in the briefing note and the attachments.
- She will give her recollections of the Operations Committee meeting on September 23, 2008. She will recall the discussion and decision "to take a strategic approach to Strategy 2 and to collaborate with our partners to advance our interests" (CAN018502).
- She agrees with the advice given to the Operations Committee on September 23, 2008. Specifically, she agrees with the Specific Challenges and Overarching Challenges to implementing Strategy 2 that are identified at Slides 16 and 17 (CAN018434).
- Regarding those overarching challenges, she will comment on her written views that the Habitat Compliance Modernization (HCM) program focuses predominantly on compliance monitoring with some efficacy monitoring, and does not include environmental monitoring which is the focus of the WSP (CAN117286 and CAN018434).
- She will say that environmental monitoring is not part of the National Habitat Management Program (HMP). She made a presentation to Ian Matheson, the former Director General of Habitat, that included an option to incorporate environmental

monitoring into the HMP. Mr. Matheson advised that a business case for this would need to be made.

- Regarding those overarching challenges, she will also comment on the need for integration between Strategies 1, 2 and 3. She will say that Strategies 2 and 3 should inform each other, including their monitoring approaches, and that a CU's habitat should be understood as a sub-set of the ecosystem. She will say that DFO received input recommending integration of Strategies 2 and 3.
- She will say that this integration requires the Strategy 3 indicators to be finished. Then the Strategy 2 and 3 indicators can be examined for overlap and linkages and an integrated, efficient monitoring framework for both sets of indicators could be designed which would provide guidance as to where, when and how to monitor.
- She will say that Strategy 2 implementation got ahead of Strategy 3 implementation and that this is referred to in September 23, 2008 Ops Committee deck, slide 17. Before Ms. Stalberg departed in January 2009, Ms. Reid told her that a rationale for Ms. Reid's decision to slow down Strategy 2 implementation was to let Strategy 3 catch up.
- Regarding those overarching challenges, she will comment on OHEB resourcing. She will say that, in 2008, she conducted a Strategy 2 costing exercise with WSP Habitat Working Group members. She organized and took minutes at the February 25, 2008 WSP habitat indicators costing meeting (CAN185601). She supplemented this with information gained from Steve Gotch, a team member, in the Yukon.
- With the assistance of the team, she will say that a detailed cost estimate for monitoring all the indicators across the Pacific Region in one year was generated. She will say that this was a premature exercise as it was not guided by a monitoring framework, namely which indicators would in reality be monitored and to what extent (CAN185602). She also generated a detailed cost estimate for monitoring indicators for a hypothetical single CU/watershed (CAN185603).
- She will say that this costing exercise was estimated at \$3M for the entire Region and for a single CU/watershed was estimated at \$54,830. She will say that this would not be the cost annually, because all indicators would not be monitored annually and the cost per CU would depend on the species and relevant indicators to monitor. These figures do include some salaries of DFO staff needed to support the monitoring program.
- She will say that funding is required for satellite imagery to support Step 2.3.
- She will say that she briefed Ms. Cross and Ms. Reid with this information. She believes that this costing exercise would be useful to inform Strategy 2 implementation, such as development of the monitoring framework.
- She does not know what was done with these cost estimates. She does not know if Ms. Reid presented this cost information to National Headquarters (NHQ).
- She does not know if similar costing exercises were done for other WSP Strategies.