

FIRST NATIONS WSP IMPLEMENTATION FORUM

MUSQUEAM 51ST HALL

DECEMBER 7, 2005

Jewel Thomas – Musqueam Elder – opening welcome

Arnie Narcisse – Interior Co-Chair, BC Aboriginal Fisheries Commission

- Welcome
- First Nations deeply involved in the development of the WSP
- Definition of CUs – First Nations have built up fisheries over the years – fisheries have gone by the wayside – important that we remain united
- Standardized monitoring – stock assessment capacity of First Nations is great – real role for First Nations in stock assessment activity – cost efficiency involved in engaging First Nations
- Assessment of habitat status – assessments done through FRBC (Fisheries Renewal BC) by First Nations – waiting for implementation (don't need to recreate the wheel).
- Inclusion of ecosystem values/monitoring – First Nations relationships with salmon goes back a long way – built on recognition of relationship between First Nations and salmon
- Integrated strategic planning – this is the table where 'things' are going to happen (at this level) – First Nations have to be at this table (CU definition, benchmarks/triggers), or WSP won't advance. Use of IHPC (Integrated Harvest Planning Committee) – needs to be a place for First Nations and a meaningful role

Rebecca Reid – Regional Director, Treaty and Aboriginal Policy, DFO

- First Nations have played a critical role in the development of the Wild Salmon Policy, and I would like to acknowledge in particular the contributions of the BC Aboriginal Fisheries Commission. I think we all recognize that the future for salmon rests in our ability to work together, and with other interests.

Chris Corrigan – Facilitator: Round of Introductions

Mark Saunders – WSP Co-ordinator, DFO (presentation on development and implementation of WSP)

Q: Are their protective measurements in place to address what happened this summer on the Fraser (weak stock management)?

Q: Like what I'm hearing – but there is a disconnect – where is the meat in this? Information and strategic planning – what does it tie into in terms of actions to do the restoration and maintenance. Are there changes to regulatory regimes (i.e. CEAA) that are tied to the planning steps?

A: Should become clearer as discussion progresses today. Actions will come out of strategic plans. i.e. if there is recognition of a concern – that plan stipulates measures to reverse or restore the situation (i.e. habitat – free up staff to work on education/best practices – work together with First Nations and other interests to take steps to turn it around – 'steps' would inform DFO work). Regulatory process has to align to WSP / more difficult to see linkages. Need to link regulatory work to actions needed under WSP.

Q: Competing priorities and policies within DFO (i.e. aquaculture (CEAA) screening process). DFO's promotion of aquaculture siting is in direct conflict with the WSP (i.e. north coast sitings on the Skeena). Which is the dominant policy – WSP or aquaculture promotion?

A: Conservation is the priority. Need to look at how the two policies interact – CEAA screening process needs to be informed by WSP.

Q: There is no informative process to link the two – how do you bridge the stovepipes within the department – and make this policy dominant in the face of competing policies?

A: Internal connections need some work as well – linking stovepipes has to happen internally.

Q: What do we do in the interim? This is taking place on the ground right now – we don't have a mechanism that allows us to deal with it right now.

A: We are at a higher level – but your point is a good one – and we need to work on building those bridges internally.

Chris: Is there something obvious that you see that could make that linkage?

C: CEAA is done in isolation of other line processes within the Department. CEAA should not be done within the Department's process – should be separate. In the case of the sitings on the Skeena, Area resource management and science does not have the ability to affect the process even though they shared our concerns.

Q: The aquaculture issue was raised in every community we went to – how can WSP be enforced when they (DFO) are part of the problem (fish farm promoters)? DFO is involved in the development of bad practices. How are Aboriginal people going to fit into this policy – what are the economic

opportunities? Every policy DFO has put in place for the last 50 years has not worked for Aboriginal people (or anybody).

Q: Funding – who is doing the Fraser River science work (contracting First Nations communities?)

C: Biggest problem in front of us is the lack of answers from DFO. Is a five year review adequate – should be reviewed annually by an independent body (i.e. BCAFC). The only thing that will restore habitat will be time – hundreds of years. RDG made a statement that wild salmon and farmed salmon are compatible. Must show conclusively that this is true. ½ of the budget is slated for the Fraser River – the rest of this province needs work too.

Chris: Acknowledge advice on annual review / resource allocation is not enough. How can we create a conversation today that gets more resources into this program?

C: Flag issue: hatcheries (have a major impact on wild salmon). Policy acknowledges the problem but does not address it. My area suffers from impacts of hatcheries – wild salmon have taken a major hit.

Q: The reason CEAA doesn't deal with problems – doesn't deal with accumulated impact assessment. There needs to be an analysis of federal legislation/policies that are affected by the WSP – identify what legislation is not meeting the needs of the policy. CEAA will be reviewed – these kinds of issues need to be addressed. Next 5 years – logging practices will increase (more than in the last 30 years) – mostly in the Prince George/Quesnel area. How do we deal with that? In order to have a WSP – we need to have habitat. How are we going to save the habitat?

Chris: WSP *COULD* be influential in a lot of areas – need a map to track the connections between the WSP and other regulations/legislation (both federal and provincial).

C: Need a convergence matrix of what WSP is meant to do, and all of the other legislative structures that could impact it. The policy has to deal with harmful practices that could have an impact.

Q: Need a regulatory map, but we also need a geographical map (tribal). First Nations have tribal areas – how will the WSP map match with First Nations' tribal maps?

A: Not going to carve up the province based on CUs – these are not geo-political boundaries – they are populations of salmon. They have to match up.

STRATEGY 1: JIM IRVINE, Research Scientist, DFO

Presentation (power point)

Comments by Jim: CUs are not management units. CUs are groups of salmon that have been identified using scientific and traditional information.

Fundamental units of genetic integrity – distinct units. CUs are not geographic areas – not watersheds – they are groups of salmon that live in different areas and habitats during their life. i.e. Cultus Lake sockeye as a CU – they rear in Cultus Lake, but they also use other systems. A group of salmon that live in different areas and different habitats throughout their life. There is no ONE agency or group that can assess these units because they migrate around the ocean and in different rivers/streams.

CUs differ among species – sockeye – defined by where the young sockeye rear – very little mixing with sockeye that rear in another system. Could be 100 CUs for sockeye, but it could be more. Not realistic to expect that we can manage 100 units. We will probably pool them together.

Chum/pinks – not faithful to rearing areas – move around a lot. CUs for chum will be much larger - could have management units within a CU. Controlled more by marine factors than by freshwater factors. Pinks have odd/even year runs – these will also be distinct from one another. CUs will be separate depending on the year of return.

Coho/Chinook – more controlled by freshwater environment – stray more than sockeye. Size of CUs will be intermediate (between sock, and chum/pink).

Assessment/Monitoring their status – red/amber/green – continuum of status. Identify benchmarks (points between red/amber/green).

DFO has preliminary list – need to incorporate local knowledge.

C: Comparability of data – international integration (has to be in line with what is used by Alaska and NIMFS). US considers Canadian data anecdotal. PSARC is not peer review – needs to go out to a scientific journal review process. PSARC won't cut it at the Pacific Salmon Treaty table (as far as proof of peer review).

A: Canada does it better – difference between approaches – US – ESUs / CAN – CUs don't have to be evolutionarily significant.

C: US won't accept TEK as “scientific” – consider it to be anecdotal.

A: Canada has built on US experience – role of TEK is really important. It's important that the methodology is peer reviewed (better through a primary journal).

Q: How would TEK be incorporated into the planning cycle? There are lots of extirpated stocks within Aboriginal traditional territories. Strict scientific considerations would eliminate those stocks and prevent rebuilding.

A: Trying to link DFO information system to TEK.

C: DFO's database is limited – commission an investigation with First Nations that will give us a broader scope of genetic currency.

Chris: How do we incorporate TEK into benchmarks?

C: Incorporated into our own information systems – can't be separated (and therefore cannot be considered anecdotal).

Q: Timelines for CUs?

A: Preliminary list of CUs by the end of March – consultation ongoing.

Q: Who is going to decide where the CUs are going to be? Will they infringe on Aboriginal rights and economic opportunities?

A: DFO will consult with First Nations and others on the preliminary list of CUs – seeking input over the next year.

C: CUs will push Aboriginal people out of the fishing industry.

A: Definition of CUs – looking for input. Infringement of rights will happen during decision-making process – First Nations need to be engaged every step of the way. CU is NOT a management unit.

Q: Will you go to every Aboriginal community on the coast?

A: We will offer opportunities for bilateral discussions – and we will be talking this afternoon how First Nations can be involved in planning.

C: Accommodation needs to be part of the consultation process.

Q: Have CUs already been implemented?

A: Some CUs have been identified – but we haven't got a full list of CUs that DFO is working from right now. There are designated units that have already been identified under SARA.

Q: How are you planning to go ahead in your consultation process – are you doing it First Nation by First Nation or using tribal geographies?

Chris: How do we gather TEK (through consultation), and how does accommodation take place?

Q: Benchmarks that would trigger restoration activity (particularly when it slips into the red zone) – how would benchmarks be defined?

A: Benchmarks are measures of status – rather than decision-making points. Two most important things you have to know how many are there (abundance) and how are they distributed.

Q: Sockeye – as conservation units (live in lakes). Below the lower benchmark – it is likely that the population could be considered to be at risk of extinction under SARA. What is the minimum population (from a genetics perspective) – 1-5,000 adults for a small sockeye lake? Coho/Chinook with multiple populations – have to apply minimum criteria to the population or assure that you have distribution throughout.

Q: For a small sockeye population with a population that has never gone above 5,000 (i.e. 30 lakes in Area 5).

A: This is where we have the biggest gap of knowledge (northern and central coast lakes) – work is beginning.

Chris: Does something come to mind for you in terms of criteria.

A: Needs to be a priority in terms of this policy – need to know what the triggers are.

Q: Monitoring and assessment – response teams – what is composition of teams?

A: There won't be a response team for every conservation unit – will deal with CUs in the red zone. Propose to use a similar process to SARA – multi-interest representation (DFO, Province, stakeholders and First Nations).

Q: Will the composition change to be more inclusive of First Nations?

A: We haven't resolved that – what would you suggest?

Q: Depends on the mandate of the group...

A: Verify the status (i.e. if it's in trouble); group would be tasked with figuring out how to get it out of that situation.

C: Consultative approaches – issue of incorporating TEK. Unless we deal with this out front, we risk losing it under a scientific process. Perhaps we need a

foundation document that characterizes TEK/ATK – will help to define role of First Nations.

C: Disconnect between priorities and SARA – from a First Nations point of view – green zone is when you can fish a population. Area 12 -100 streams – disaster area – can't fish – being crunched by SARA. Balance is missing. Want to see a priority to focus on Area 12 – has fallen between the cracks – nobody knows whether it's north or central coast – not being dealt with – we have a willing pilot waiting. First Nations standard for the health of salmon stocks “can I eat it, catch it, sell it” – if not – there is a conservation problem.

C: Area 5 – used to have a program (\$\$) to maintain streams. Once the \$\$ ran out – things started to go downhill – lakes are damaged. We've been crunched down to one area for fishing. Need to find resources to get First Nations involved in restoring this habitat.

Q: What is a management unit? What role do the IHPC (Integrated Harvest Planning Committee) have in the implementation of the WSP?

A: Mgmt unit – depends on who you are talking to – DFO uses it as an artificial construct to determine what can be caught. First Nations may have another perspective.

C: TEK is site specific and tribal specific in areas. DFO has less information than First Nations. Consultation – AAROM bodies have been developed to deal with consultation. It's up to us to decide what will be discussed at what level (local, area, regional, national, international). There may be specific consultations that happen within an area (i.e. Knight's Inlet) – very specific to the area – good example of where Aboriginal science can be involved in developing a restoration plan.

STRATEGY 2: Gary Taccogna, WSP Habitat Co-ordinator, DFO

presentation on assessment of habitat status

Q: Document range and most productive habitats used by each CU – could devalue the most productive areas – connected to MSY (maximum sustainable yield). It's not about most productive habitat – those smaller “less productive” stocks could be the highest value in terms of currency. Can we change the wording “Productive” ?

C: Needs to identify the fragmented systems that restrict salmon from rearing/spawning in that area – quite a few have been identified (CN). Migration impediments created by linear developments.

Q: Can we add industrial zones as impediments (urban vs. watershed) – this is a huge data gap?

A: Benchmark for urban areas - % of watershed covered by impervious surfaces.

A: Habitat diversity – creates the genetic diversity – productive habitats may produce a lot of fish today, but maybe not tomorrow. Important to have continuity/connectivity between habitats – no point in having fragmented habitats where fish cannot create exchanges.

Q: Are the two status reports (habitat and CU) going to be vetted through the technical working groups of the AAROM bodies?

C: There is no template for AAROM – Skeena technical committee is already driving that process – capacity has been there for a long time. Need to bring up the standard of capacity where it is a collaborative effort. Consultation is moot in the face of effective co-management. On the Skeena, yes there is capacity – it's different on a group by group basis. The process needs to be common – depth of collaboration will be connected to capacity of each First Nations group. Need to build at the ground level up.

A: Where there is capacity DFO would welcome that approach. Where capacity isn't in place – we are not ONLY going to work with AAROM groups. As capacity is developed, this relationship will change.

C: Not all First Nations are part of the AAROM process.

A: DFO needs to recognize where relationships already exist.

Q: Where does the assessment of habitat arise?

C: You're missing an enforcement component (i.e. agricultural practices / pipeline).

A: That is a Provincial jurisdiction. We are using education as a tool for protecting habitat (for those that are using bad practices).

Q: DFO can't lay charges?

A: Yes, if there is an offence under the Fisheries Act.

C: We have these repetitive meetings and nothing gets done. It bothers me that you have to prove that someone is harming habitat. There needs to be stiffer penalties for farmers (and logging companies) along the river (who harm habitat). We don't have technologists in our area – who are you going to send to

Prince George (1.5 hrs. west) to check out the habitat destruction (need response). First Nations have known there are problems for a long time – use local knowledge. We are ignoring the interior of the province – get on with it.

C: DFO is putting the cart before the horse with this process – need a collaborative process with the Province, and then together you come to First Nations.

LUNCH BREAK

STRATEGY 3: Inclusion of Ecosystem Values and Monitoring **Jim Irvine**

Arnie's comments to participants: Glad you are asking the questions. WSP must ensure the protection and sustainability of those stocks. What is the abundance worth? Individual populations – as with people there are First Nations populations, then that breaks down to individual bands and then families and cousins. First Nations would never give one up. The protection of each individual species is important. When you get to representation make sure you are heard.

Jim: Example of WSP that benefited from consultation. Example of how we incorporated consultations last year. Need to consider salmon part of the ecosystem. The policy includes ecosystem, values and monitoring. Less obvious how we can include ecosystem values while maintaining diversity and sustainability. Clearly an area where First Nations will have input into the strategy of this policy.

We are proposing an expert panel which would include academics, stakeholders and First Nations. This group will meet with different stakeholders and First Nations. Idea is we would develop an ecosystem framework over the next 18 months.

Q: What do you mean by expert panel?

A: Will get back to that question (in Strategy 4) and will ask who should be on the expert panel. 1st step would take place in January – workshop attempting to identify who will be on the expert panel and map out the process of the next 1.5 yrs. We would encourage people to come.

Q: How is this expert panel going to do the work of the ecosystem monitoring strategy?

A: Identify indicators, linking what goes on in the ocean to fresh water. We can't ignore what is going on in the ocean. Need to integrate these two components.

It would be a consensus building process. Hold multiple facilitated meetings. Outside circles representing different interest groups, representation of First Nations and stakeholders. We need to identify this core group (expert panel). They would meet numerous times over the next two years. Knowledge will develop over time with expert panel. People need to go back to their groups let them know what is going on. DFO will not manage the expert panel. DFO will have members but we will not be leading it. DFO is a stakeholder. This panel would stay in place over 1.5 yrs and would be responsible for making recommendations and coming up with ecosystem values that will be monitored in the future. Proposing workshop in January. Talking to other consultants for only first workshop develop in more detail the example on screen (process).

C: Experts are the First Nations that live in those areas. It is time that you recognize that First Nations in the areas are the experts and you need to come and talk to us. Sport fishing camps and the fishing crews go through our area each year and they don't talk to us. You need to talk to the experts that live in the areas. The fish there are important for us to protect.

Q: I hear that there is going to be extensive planning and then there is going to be a huge amount of collaborative work with First Nations communities, regionally and internationally, and I hear there will be large scale projects. Will the panel set the stage and parameters for future works?

A: We will be having a workshop to determine who the experts will be. Over the 1.5 years that group will be a work in progress.

Q: What kind of specialist would participate in the expert panel? It should be specialist not experts, people that understand ecosystems. Who chooses who these specialists are?

A: That will be the goal of the workshop in January. There will be some need for traditional scientific expertise - western science knowledge and people who understand nutrients going through the ecosystem.

Chris: The terms of reference will be set at the January workshop. First Nations need to be there.

Q: Unclear of the next step. What is the product?

A: This expert panel will probably be meeting every six weeks at a location and the panel and their knowledge would develop over time. In between the meetings the individuals would go back to their constituency that they come from and consult and bring back those views. Instead of DFO meeting with all these groups the representatives will bring forth the ideas of their constituents.

C: Representatives and constituents re: spawning escapement issues. There is no process in place by which they assign or appoint someone who represents hundreds of people and different groups. It's hard for a few First Nations to represent a few groups.

C: WSP implementation work plan – Strategy 3 – the following steps will provide the mix of scientific understanding and ecosystem values. Ecosystem values – community driven. Will this have some ability to create different types of values for different ecosystems. How will First Nations rebuild their own salmon stocks? Who are the drivers? Ecosystem values have become the drivers instead of scientific understanding. It would seem each community would be able to set their own ecosystem values.

Chris: A change in approach by using a value system.

C: Eco system framework - a lot of that work has been done through other projects-millennium assessment (talked about earlier), through the World Resource Institute, at an international level, ecosystem indicators have been developed. There are cultural indicators, put forward as the health of our culture which has to do with salmon. Do a literature review and see what has been happening. First Nations have ecosystem experts, knowledge that is being past down from generation to generation. Bring that kind of review back and indicators that have already been developed.

Chris: Diversity of experts. Elders have a long history of traditional ecosystem values. Whole culture – land value based.

C: Need to be cautious when recognizing this panel of experts.

C: DFO needs to take into account First Nations accommodation. More than the extra step that has been provided to other groups.

Q: There are policies that affect those values – water quality, water licences, sedimentation, the Ministry have other policies. Need to integrate with other government bodies. There are other existing authorities – How will the WSP work with these other policies and agencies?

Q: Needs to be an inclusion of First Nations values and monitoring. Can DFO change the name?

Chris: Traditional knowledge paper – how TEK is used. How can we have a values based conversation to incorporate what we know?

Q: Expert panel to work through the issue and go back to the constituents. Is DFO attempting pushing the consultation process through this panel?

A: We are trying to develop an assessment framework over 18 months. This seemed to be a logical way to achieve that goal by the end of next year. This will not replace any government to government consultation. We want to put in place a plan that we can effectively monitor ecosystems.

Q: Where WSP falls off SARA then steps in. A consultant is hired to determine the value of sport fishery, commercial, tourism but there was no First Nation value determined. This is a slippery slope. Environment Canada and DFO pull together a team who can evaluate the value of First Nations fishing. Leaders need to have some valid discussion of that. Value of the right. Where has it been done before, what was good about it and how do we move beyond that?

A: We don't have a lot of time or resources but these are the ideas that can be addressed.

C: The experts are out there in that ecosystem. You have to go to them. There isn't a hall or budget big enough. At the spawning escapement issues (meetings yesterday), the group is brought together, info is reviewed and then that info is taken out to the communities from the findings.

A: How can we go to each band?

C: The real expert comments on the framework.

A: The panel might work but we need to go beyond that. We need to go out and consult on what the panel comes up with.

C: This panel will figure out how First Nations will fit into that process. Commercial salmon advisory board looks at how First Nations will fit into that reform. First Nations want to decide how they will fit into First Nations issues. Each time First Nations are asked how do you want to be involved? First Nations want to be totally involved in the stock assessment, enforcement, management, habitat restoration.

C: You can't use reductionist models to get away from DFO responsibilities. We have 96 groups all who manifest the same right to the resource. They should all have the ability to voice that (capacity building). We are going to be in a constant battle, it is not simple or convenient.

A: Tired of hearing DFO can't meet with all First Nations groups. How can you manage the resource that you stole from us? First Nations are the rightful owners of land and resources. DFO needs to consult.

Chris: Very clear message that the bar is being set high.

C: How are so many Canadians' groups represented but First Nations are put into one box. Canadians are encouraged to come as different representatives in the community. I am not seeing the same chance for First Nations.

A: Expert panel – it's a trade off – we can't have too many people.

Chris: Equitable diversity – Canadian get a bunch of voices and only one voice for First Nations. First Nations need more voices.

Q: Concern how is this First Nations voice going to be communicated at the multi-stakeholder table tomorrow? Will DFO say what was heard today or are there representatives going tomorrow to express what First Nations said here?

Q: The problems are the same at international level re: experts. 15 indigenous peoples' names were put forward for panel, out of the 700 only 1 Aboriginal person was chosen. We need people who have specialties, i.e. elders, but there are things such as language barriers. Looking at developing a framework not implementing framework. How do you put people forward as expert from an indigenous group? Experts with clear terms of reference?

A: For the workshop in January, give names to Jim Irvine or Mark Saunders so they are encouraged to attend.

Chris: You know experts at the local level. The challenge is how do you translate that depth of TEK that could be brought forward to the expert panel?

Q: Is there one panel for all of BC or is there a panel for the north, south, lower?

A: One panel.

Q: You need to respect the natural divisions that are there. How can you only have one panel?

A: Panel will be scoped out in more detail or it may be decided this won't work.

C: Make sure this panel is not interest based or geographic based but qualification based. The expert would represent themselves.

C: DFO needs to know their lines. We need to have a place where the policy issues can be worked out separate of the technical areas. When the issues are combined it is impossible to get clarity. If you can peel the parts apart it will be separate from different interests.

STRATEGY 4: Integrated Strategic Planning

Mark Saunders

Mark: This is the critical part of the policy. To effect any real change it is what we do with that information. How do we effect change? We need a process for integrated strategic planning for each CU. What are our goals and objectives, timeframe, plans, procedures. Once we get together how do we work together? Work at developing that model. How do we work with First Nations to be engaged in this process. Need to go back to all nations. Maybe streamline through AAROM bodies through technical processes. What we are thinking right now is a pilot procedure through the Fraser River Sockeye working group -- a technical model that will help to set the long term objectives for Fraser River Sockeye. Pilot 5 step process. Response team to develop long-term plan.

How do you take into account social and economic factors? Short-term economics would trump social factors and sustainability. Put priorities on the table -- need to move the biological red zone CUs to the green. Interim process -- response teams to be formed in May. In the next four months - implementing a series of workshops to bring together people to figure out how this integrated process might work. How can we effectively engage First Nations?

Q: Are you talking about this pilot program just on the Fraser? You have other groups on the Coast and Interior. Those you do not engage in the process right away will criticize the outcomes. Need to get information. Need to get the technical process first and then social and economic levels. To mix them together are you going to have resource management and biologists write their own opinions on social and economic positions? Work to the strengths. Learn from what happened before. We don't have a lot of DFO ancient history (information -- stock assessment).

A: Fraser River Sockeye group: this group is advanced enough to allow us to test the procedure. There are other areas and maybe we could bring in other representatives to this Fraser River process. This is a mature group that worked together. It's a response team already in place. There is a fair amount of work on the CUs that could be worked on immediately by the group. Important to test drive the procedure.

C: Pointed out you have chosen to use the Fraser River Sockeye team to run the pilot. If you want peoples' genuine input try doing several pilots in different places at once.

A: We met with Fraser River Sockeye group yesterday to go down that road. There are opportunities for groups here that could be involved in that particular process. It is a proposal of how we move forward. There are a couple of small pieces we have moved forward.

Chris: Are there possibilities to start pilots in other places?

C: If the pilot in the Fraser doesn't work or who gets input? That is not collaboration. What is relatively good for DFO is not good for First Nations. It is not in the spirit of the agreement of what the Minister signs with First Nations. Don't develop policy and say we have collaborated when we haven't. Go to a couple of areas in the North and South, in Coastal areas or on the river. Pilot projects should be an inclusion not exclusion. First Nations interests should not be preordained or precooked.

C: Consider the lessons learned by First Nations and what they bring forward. Learn from past problems. Be more open. Build on new experiences.

Chris: How do we learn from the past?

Q: Money: 1.1 million what's on the table for next year – what about for the next 5 years?

A: 700K this year. Proposed 800 K for next year. Most of what we are talking about is for the next 2 years. We are putting forward work plans for next year based on what is happening this year. I believe we have support to put together work plans for collaboration. The case for the money will come after this first stage – CUs. These are the gaps of the framework and here is how we propose how we will work with DFO resources and outside resources. Once we have these plans laid out we will have a better idea.

C: The numbers you are giving are not encouraging. We have 800 K from forestry that is being put towards the river system. This is our own bands' money. There is a huge crash of local streams and many First Nations that don't have their own fish or their own boats can't enjoy there rights. You can not have buy in with First Nations as a single entity; you have to have multiple buy in.

A: The pilot on the Fraser runs to April. How would be go about developing response teams? More money might come in next years budgets.

C: Would like to see timelines. Ten years? Meaningful to have time frames and a financial plan to reach goals.

C: There is a need to bring the biological info to the table. Need to bring recovery process to the table first before we can have meaningful discussion of what needs to be done.

C: Programmatic approach is the way to draw up proposal that will attract resources. Extend the path, a little more window of opportunity.

Chris: Decentralized approach

C: Work with what you have got and go with what is ready. Look for organic structure.

Q: Lessons will converge and compound.

Chris: Integrating a body of knowledge not process. There is potential if it is done well or done right. Let's get it right.

C: We need to hear of a broader start, more pilot projects to restore a lot of the streams. We had a program a few years ago and then the \$ ran out and the guys stopped working. The money issue is important. We need more money to involve our community to restore these lakes and rivers. In our communities we are not going anywhere – we are the ones who will stay on the land. We need to be involved in rebuilding the stocks and working together. Money and funding should be available for other projects to try and focus on rebuilding the stocks. There is the damage the seals do in the river. This isn't on the table. We have to be involved in getting those things out of there. We all need to be in these discussions.

C: DFO manages the fishery on the coast but 80% is spent on the Fraser and Skeena. There are a lot of other rivers besides those rivers. Yet we seem to ignore those areas. If this is going to work this has got to change. Coastal areas are not no mans land, written off by DFO. We hope this policy would change this.

A: We need to commit to and respect our legal obligations. Need to consult and fulfill requirements for food, social and ceremonial purposes. There are voices here I need to hear from. I try to do the best I can with talking with First Nations and reflect that in the policy and implementation.

C: DFO needs to understand the social problems including housing, suicide; we need to do much to make our communities healthy again.

A: When we talk about a 5 step process and look at the priorities and values such as "I want to be able to catch fish, eat fish and sell it." Those are values and indicators in a process. They need to be in the green. This is how we will ultimately develop them into plans.

Q: Pilot on the Fraser – this is news to First Nations that this was going on. Is that a financial issue or a technical capacity issue?

A: Both. If we want to move forward in other areas, in terms of capacity and resources, we need to do that now.

Q: Some problems with pilots – AFS, pilot of 1993 – First Nations are skeptical of pilots. Why was 400K given for assessment on the Fraser? That should have

been separate from the 1.1 million. There is no stock assessment framework in the Fraser and what role would First Nations play in that frame work? We do a lot of work on Sockeye, Chinook and Coho on the river. How do the projects we do and the information we collect fit into the Fraser river management? WSP implementation – fill in the gaps. The Skeena system could move forward as a pilot, they have people, data and capacity. They should be able to move forward, especially if they bring forestry monies to the table. Those groups should be able to put forward how they will input the WSP. In order to move forward on the WSP, everyone needs to buy in that First Nations should be the lead component. Long ways to providing some collaboration with First Nations and DFO.

A: Good comments on how to move forward with WSP. Five step pilot a very small component. We need to work in larger regions.

Chris: Why don't you come and work with us we have the capacity?

C: We would like to protect the stocks – fish and wildlife and the habitat. We are in dire straights to get some tough laws to be implemented, to have companies fined and have that money put back into the communities to do the work of what has been destroyed. I don't want to see my grandchild come here and fight for the same things. My ancestors did a lot to save our country and now we are talking about saving fish stocks. We all have concerns. We are multi-cultural. We have been respecting our food fish for many years. Think carefully before you implement policy that changes and effects First Nations lives. We are forever explaining ourselves; protect our rights, values, culture. If we don't save the salmon what happens to the crabs, clams and everything else out in the ocean.

A: The above suggestion will bring the province to the table. There is \$ already out there. There are groups doing the work already.

C: We have 4 lakes that are traditional to us. We went through treaties to have the lakes looked at. DFO wouldn't do it. We now know how many fish we have. We manage our fisheries and treaty items for forestry. In the treaty process, for healing we got a grant to start up our own fisheries to map stream beds. We know which creeks have fish in them. Our next step is to clean the creeks. It's a 3 phase program. We are managing our own fish. We now had a call from DFO in Smithers. They have \$ left to do some work, they phone us up and ask if we would work with them to do studies on trout. We brought this back to the treaty table and now we have funds for 3 more of our lakes. You only get so much money and then it dries up and you are right back where you started. We went out on our own and did it ourselves. This is to keep our salmon coming back. Elmbidge pipe line they will be going through everyone's territory sooner or later. Does DFO have any records on these guys?

C: Concerned with planning priorities and resource management. Tomorrow (wsp multi-sector forum) we are going to sit with our competing sectors in the fishery. I just hope the DFO is not going to use the WSP as our access to the fishery. The other groups will have different priorities than First Nations. Don't use it against our access to the resource.

C: I have worked as a fisheries liaison for 5 years. We go through the CSTC. I hear a lot of comments about the Fraser Valley. If I were to get money I would have to go to meetings. It took me 4 years to get sturgeon protocol money. It usually takes someone to go to the meeting to ask for \$. The interior is different than the coast – we don't have seals, crabs or shrimp. We fight for our animals as one body, the mountain species, the lakes and streams that go into all the streams, lakes and ocean. When we come to the table it is just the upper Fraser and now I come to a table with everyone here -- coastal and commercial. There are a lot of things affecting the animals -- logging, hydro projects, oil and gas and mining. Since they put the hydro project into our lake we are worried about steelhead, sturgeon and coho. We are doing studies on a volunteer basis to figure out where the steelhead are and where they come from. Last few months I have seen 2 owls on my reserve. Where are they coming from? We have numbers of people from the US coming in to fish. Guides don't come to us and say we have a licence to guide people to fish in you traditional territory. People in our community who have been leaders have helped out the band. You speak of the expert panel; I have a fisheries technician who would be great on that expert panel. She could be our game warden but they don't look at it like that. They don't recognize those things. Talking about expert panels, the majority of our elders are our experts. There are a lot of maps and paper trails. Some are on video. I have been working on a mapping project for 3 years. I mark out where we do trapping, fishing where we go up to the mountains to show where we go and what we take out. Today we are still talking about pollution. Our animals are dying and no one seems to know. Pesticides. We gave a fish sample to DFO and they said there was nothing wrong with it. We didn't see any paper trail. We have black spots on our fish and no one does anything about that. I think it's coming from the pollution and how the government puts out the plate for our forestry industry. You know your own territory. I just wanted to put that out on the table. We all have strong leadership and voices. Our fish will be our future generation. Coming to meetings makes me stronger so I can bring that home and help my people. Many of our elders are deceased today, a lot of those strong leaders are not with us but we use the video tapes.

Arnie: I would like to commend all of you for sticking around for the duration of the day. Thanks Mark and DFO for their efforts to try to do the best they can to fulfill the consultation requirement to reconcile our rights, to reconcile those interests with First Nations rights. We must move beyond mere consultation and move towards meaningful accommodation of our rights. That will be how we will know if those people are listening. Tell the other sectors the priority of the fishery

is First Nations. The salmon has looked after us for a long time and now it is our time to look after the salmon.

Mark: It is very difficult to sum up a meeting such as this, they are emotional and I take a lot away from these meetings on many levels. In terms of this dialogue this has been extraordinary.

To articulate what was said today:

- Where does this go from here? I think your voices will be heard.
- Some work plans are in place but what has been said here today we will be able to incorporate for next year.

Key messages:

- Need a matrix to identify how the WSP links to other policies not just in DFO but with other governments. This will help clarify how we move forward with the regulatory process.
- Assembling First Nations understanding: the genetic currency of past and present stocks.
- Recognition of scientific review. First Nations are not willing to sacrifice any component of the structure.
- How do we engage First Nations. We still need to contact First Nations - there is no way to bypass this. We can work with other groups to help with technical requirements but we have an obligation to meet with First Nations.
- Need to think about framework pulling the information together on habitat. Bring Province together to talk about the framework

Strategy 3

- Need to look at our model. Concern about representative system (proposal for consultation).
- Need to realize the experts are in the ecosystems and in the area we want to study.
- We need to connect with those experts.
- Delegation of DFO to consult.
- First Nations want to decide how that should work.

Strategy 4

- Need to talk ahead of time of the work that is going on in the Fraser.
- Take away messages in other regions.
- Need to meet very quickly in that regards to look at a way to engage First Nations and how we will move in implementing the WSP in their area.
- Identify those strengths and gaps really quickly so we can go for resources. How do we work with the money that may be out there?
- As we do that we need to make sure we don't lose areas that aren't receiving large amounts of resources (Interior and PG – Fraser Lake).

Thank you to Musqueam, Chris and others.

Delbert – Musqueam Elder: I have listened to some of the discussion today, I remember when there where fish in all the streams up in North Vancouver. There was shellfish until the treatment plant came in and brought pollution. Doesn't matter which way we look. It would be nice to see the strong movement and rejuvenate the wild stocks.

\\svbcvanfp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal Drives\FAM\Paul_
Ryall\Email\1st part of 2006\WSP\

CAN168237_0021