

CULTUS SOCKEYE RECOVERY ACTIVITIES

Monthly Update for November, 2004

RECOVERY TEAM:

- The Recovery Team met on November 15 to discuss the consultation results, the Minister of the Environment's proposed decision to not list Cultus sockeye under SARA, and the projects being considered for DFO SARA funding in 2005 (Attachment #1).
- The Team met by conference call on November 19 to discuss its response to the Minister's proposal (Attachment #2). The Team finalized a letter to the Regional Director General that was sent the same day (Attachment #3).

WORK GROUPS

Stock Assessment/Fisheries Management: No activity in November.

Habitat: The Work Group met on November 9 to discuss the pikeminnow, milfoil and habitat assessment projects as well as public awareness and engagement projects that are planned or underway (Attachment #4).

Enhancement: Activity restricted to regular conference calls discussing operational issues.

Pikeminnow/Milfoil: No activity in November.

STOCK ASSESSMENT:

- The count of adult sockeye at the Sweltzer fence totals 90, of which 38 have been retained for captive broodstock. Underwater video surveys conducted at Honeymoon and Spring bays on November 23 observed three sockeye holding over gravel suitable for spawning. Additional surveys are planned for early December with the objective of surveying all known spawning areas in 2004. For detailed daily information, see the following web site: [Fraser River/Interior Area Fisheries Management Homepage](#)

MILFOIL/PREDATOR/HABITAT PROJECTS:

- A final report was received from Foreshore Technologies Inc. documenting the milfoil mapping work conducted in September (contact: Brad Fanos).
- Planning for additional biophysical surveys is currently underway.
- Planning for milfoil removal is underway. Arrangements are being made for the rototiller and operator to begin operation in January. An application will be forwarded to HEB for approval by mid December (contact: Dave Barnes).
- Recent heavy rains, high turbidity and high winds have hampered efforts to determine whether pikeminnows can be angled during winter.
- Analysis will begin this week on the stomach contents of pikeminnows captured during the summer (contact: Dave Barnes).

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: No activity in October.

ENHANCEMENT: See the attached summary table. A large number of captive brood fish were successfully spawned at Rosewall Creek, including a significant number (264) of 2001 brood year females. A handful of natural spawners were spawned at Cultus Lake Lab. A large number of distinct matings were achieved by matrix spawning using fresh and cryo-preserved milt.

Calendar 2004-Releases to Date								
Brood Year	Source	Designation	Mark Type	Release				
				Date(s)	Location	Type	Number	Weight (g)
2002	Wild Egg-Take	Captive Excess	Ad/Lv	11-Mar-04	Cultus Lake	Super Smolt	515	73.00
2002	Wild Egg-Take	Captive Excess	Ad/Rv	11-Mar-04	Sweltzer Creek	Super Smolt	540	76.00
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Supplementation	¹ Unmarked	6-May-04	Cultus Lake	Fed Fry	8274	0.14
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Supplementation	¹ Unmarked	7-Jun-04	Cultus Lake	Fed Fry	16738	0.15
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Supplementation	¹ Unmarked	18-Jun-04	Cultus Lake	Fed Fry	7728	0.13
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Supplementation	Ad/Calcein	31-Jul-04	Cultus Lake	Spring Fry	148448	1.07
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Supplementation	Ad Only	5-Oct-04	Cultus Lake	Fall Parr	147053	4.52
2003	Captive-RWC	Supplementation	Ad Only	5-Oct-04	Cultus Lake	Fall Parr	16419	4.01
2002	Wild Egg-Take	Captive Excess	² Unmarked	22-Oct-04	Cultus Lake	sub-Adult	249	950.00
2003	Captive-RWC	Supplementation	³ Ad Only	23-Nov-04	Cultus Lake	Fall Parr	1342	6.91

¹Rejected for captive program because of "low negative" or incomplete adult screening results. Short-term rearing (<10% wt gain from ponding)

²Size and unique scale patterns can easily differentiate from wild. No requirement or option for continued rearing and may assist wild spawning.

³This was the last-ponded Rosewall group and was too small for inclusion with 5-Oct rls, so reared additional period to align with wild-sized parr.

On Hand Rosewall Creek					Comments
Brood Year	Source	Designation	Stage	Number	
2000	Wild Smolt	Captive	3+	432	Spawned 32 females, similar number showing signs of maturation, few males Spawned 264 females & sacrificed 50 males after spawning, reusing remaining ripe males Few fish maturing at this time
2001	Wild Egg-Take	Captive	2+	351	
2001	Wild Smolt	Captive	2+	428	
2002	Wild Egg-Take	Captive	1+	741	
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Captive	Parr	1504	Please Note: Egg survival to eyed (next) stage only 45% at Rosewall in 2003.
2004*	Captive-RWC	**Supplementation	Egg	~608000	

*All fish maturing through the fall and winter period will be denoted as 2004 brood, regardless of actual calendar date of spawning.

**Majority of eggs from 2001 wild egg-take group have poor genetic variation. Appropriate matings from remainder will see eggs streamed into captive brood.

On Hand Pitt Sockeye Satellite (Inch Creek)					Comments
Brood Year	Source	Designation	Stage	Number	
2002	Wild Egg-Take	Captive Back-up	1+	50	8-10 obvious males with remainder showing limited signs of maturation Currently ~13g. Will be growth restricted for ~20g smolt rls in spring of 2005 Currently ~13g. Will be growth advanced for possible maturation in fall of 2005 For spring 2005 smolt release at ~13-15g Held from July 31/04 rls group to study calcein persistence & rls as smolt at ~13-15g
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Captive Back-up	Parr	1368	
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Captive Back-up	Parr	305	
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Supplementation	Parr	50156	
2003	Wild Egg-Take	Supplementation	Parr	125	

On Hand Cultus Lab					Comments
Brood Year	Source	Designation	Stage	Number	
2004	Wild Broodstock Collection		Adult	4 females	5 females matrix-spawned to date (90 matings, fresh & cryo-preserved sperm) Expect low survivals with cryo fertilization matrix, intend for captive stream only
2004	Wild Egg-Take	Captive	Egg	~12500	

OTHER:

- A 2x3 inclined plane trap was installed in Sweltzer Creek upstream from the enumeration fence to monitor the emigration of sockeye fry that were planted in the lake in October 13.

High water has hampered trap operation. (contact: Dave Barnes).

- A committee formed to monitor lake levels and apprise Lindell Beach residents of DFO actions regarding aquifer work and Frosst Creek flood control measures has been put on hold until the Chair of the Cultus Lake Park Board is replaced.
- Siltation and gravel movement in Hatchery Creek (tributary to Sweltzer Creek) continues to be an issue. Local Fishery Officers have done an outstanding job of responding to complaints; the issue related to trucks hauling rock during heavy rain. There is a jurisdictional issue regarding the road; C&P continues to investigate.

Attachment #1.

**MEETING NOTES
CULTUS SOCKEYE RECOVERY TEAM**

**SFU at Harbour Centre, Vancouver
November 15, 2004
09:00 to 15:00**

Present:	Mike Bradford Bruce Clark Ken Connolly Michael Folkes Jim Gable	Jeff Grout Scott Hinch Mark Johnson Frank Kwak Don MacKinlay	Rob Morley Neil Schubert Ken Shortreed Chris Wood
Regrets:	Bill Gazey Doug Kelly	Linsey Pestes Jim Roberts	Ernie Victor Doug Wilson
Alternates:	Nelson Kahama		
Guests:	Brian Harvey Dave Barnes	John Davis Stu Barnetson	Brian Riddell Bill Otway

Consultation Feedback

Recovery Team members, who had participated in the consultations that were conducted in Prince Rupert, Port Hardy, Campbell River, Nanaimo, Victoria, Vancouver and Chilliwack, provided feedback to the Team. Most was negative:

- Very few members of First Nations or the public attended any of the sessions and, even when attendance was good (Vancouver, Chilliwack), the Cultus discussion was scheduled last on the agenda when most of the attendees had disappeared and attention was poor. One Team member described the process as “an enormous waste of time;”
- Because very few participants had read the Recovery Strategy, responses were based on either the presentation or “motherhood” interests or perceptions of the individual;
- There were many unsubstantiated assumptions, e.g., because there is heavy recreational use, habitat must have played a role in the decline;
- The timing of the listing announcement negatively impacted the utility of the consultations;
- Too many issues were covered; we should have focused only on the three salmon species;
- There was an over-balance of Departmental staff versus the public (at least three to one).

While there were no significant criticisms of the Recovery Strategy at any of the sessions, there are some areas where the Team should consider revision or increased emphasis:

- There is a perception that recovery will require all fisheries to close. The *Approaches to Meeting Recovery Objectives/ Control of exploitation* section should be made more explicit;
- There is a perception that over-fishing has not stopped. The *Actions Already Completed or Underway/Control of exploitation* should be reviewed and changed, if appropriate;
- Participants wanted greater detail in approaches to community engagement, especially as it related to habitat issues, e.g., educating landowners in the use of pesticides and fertilizers, installing information

- kiosks at the various parks, etc.; and
- Participants complained that they rarely see fishery officers in the area and suggested that a greater enforcement presence was required.

Bill Otway provided a participant's perspective that the Department needs to review the process. His main concerns were: the structure of the meetings didn't allow effective comment; and hard copies of the strategies should have been provided before the meetings (individuals can't be expected to print out 150 pages on personal computers). He felt the Cultus Recovery Strategy was well written and answered 90% of his concerns.

Finalizing the Recovery Strategy

The draft cover is the result of searches of the archives and personal files for photographs depicting Cultus sockeye and their habitats and uses. There was concern that the photos depict anthropogenic uses that might reinforce the misconception that habitat plays a central role in the decline. Suggestions for improvement: find photos of fishing or Cultus sockeye.

The Recovery Strategy completion schedule is: finalize the text by the end of December; and begin formatting (insertion of photos, graphs, maps, etc.) in January; and complete and print by the end of March.

Action: Team members are to provide Brian Harvey and Neil Schubert with final comments and alternate photos by mid-December.

Legal Listing Presentation

Dr. John Davis, the Department's Special Advisor to the Deputy Minister on Species at Risk, provided a summary of the Minister of the Environment's October 23 announcement proposing that Cultus and Sakinaw sockeye not be listed under *SARA*. He emphasized that the work of the Team was highly valued, committed the Department to an action planning process, and stated that funding had been set aside to continue recovery work underway. The subsequent discussion is summarized below by topic.

Process for the next two months: The notice on the Canada Gazette is open for comments until November 22. The RDG of the Canadian Wildlife Service (Trevor Swerdfager) will then assemble the responses and provide them to the Department's ADM Committee (it is not clear whether there will be technical input at this stage). The Department will consider any comments received before the final decision is posted in January.

Team role and future processes: The Team requested clarification on two issues: its future role and make-up in a Department-driven, non-*SARA* process; and details regarding the action planning process, including the identification of the leader and the make-up of the Recover Implementation Group. Dr. Davis will ensure that the Team receives instructions from the Department's regional executive.

Funding for recovery: A number of members were concerned that the proposed decision would place recovery funding at risk; however, as a COSEWIC-designated population, it was pointed out that Cultus remains eligible for funding and that the Minister had committed to continue to fund recovery actions.

Consideration of Recovery Team advice: Some members expressed disappointment that the Team wasn't provided an opportunity to comment on the socio-economic evaluation of the impact of legally listing the population. Dr. Davis assured us that the review completed by Departmental members of the Stock Assessment and Fisheries Management Work would be considered by the ADM Committee. Opinions

were expressed that Cultus was trivialized in the press (the contention that it represents less than 1% of sockeye greatly understates its importance to biodiversity) and that the Work Group views were trivialized in the *Question and Answer* package that accompanied the release of the proposed decision.

New public perception of recoverability of sockeye: Team members were concerned that, if the public now believes that these sockeye populations cannot be recovered, they will assume that the restrictive measures the Department has deemed to have an unacceptable economic impact will be relaxed. Although the Department has stated that every effort will be made to recover these populations, there is now an expectation that exploitation rates can be increased and that other additional measures will not be considered. As a result, fishery managers will face increased difficulties in implementing actions required to recover Cultus that are not also required for the late run as a group.

Habitat protection: Concerns were expressed that the tools we now have are not up to the task of protecting and recovering the population. The *Fisheries Act* is not a good tool to protect habitat, including critical habitat, because it first has to be destroyed before action can be taken.

Process flaws: Concerns were expressed that *SARA*'s requirement for an irrevocable listing decision (*i.e.*, the species remains listed until it recovers or goes extinct) is overly restrictive. Under a scenario where every reasonable measure is taken to recover the population without a positive response, the Department could not reverse the decision in the face of unacceptable socio-economic impacts. Another member felt that either *SARA* was flawed, or the Department's interpretation of jeopardy was flawed. It was also noted that the process was not synchronized because the economic analysis was produced before the action plan upon which it should be based. Consequently, it required many assumptions in a process of measuring the worth or value of a species, which is difficult under any circumstances. There were also concerns that, because the analysis was produced in the Region, an opportunity was missed to utilize NHQ economists who could have produced a more professional product.

Other comments: Concerns were expressed that the analysis did not consider benefits of recovery, that the rights and values of people living 100 years from now were not considered. One member wondered how he could tell his clients that these fish are important when there is a perception that the Department does not believe they are. Another suggested that, if these species can't be listed, will it ever be possible to list any economically utilized species. Others suggested that the merging of the integrated fishery planning process and the Wild Salmon Policy could provide protection to the species. While some members noted that the analysis did not consider benefits, another noted that the costs might be underestimated because of the choice of the base harvest rate and because only impacts on the fishing industry are considered. One member suggested that First Nations would likely take the Department to court.

Discussion of Legal Listing Proposal

After considerable discussion, a consensus decision was reached that the Team should provide a formal written response to the proposed decision. The response would: a) summarize the process flaws; b) identify concerns with biological modelling (is it consistent with recovery objectives and the Team's knowledge as species experts); and c) recommend re-evaluation of the biological impacts and process improvements. Some of the issues discussed were:

- Team members questioned the assumption that exploitation rate reductions to <5% are required to recover the species, or even that populations of 500 could not sustain some level of harvest without jeopardizing recovery.
- The advice that went into the analysis did not reflect the appropriate expertise. The experts who should have been consulted were not, including the Team.

- It was suggested that the economics and policy group in Ottawa should have played a larger role, although some questioned whether it would have made any difference given the depletion of economic expertise in the Ottawa group.
- The economic analysis is not consistent with the Recovery Strategy because it makes assumptions that are much greater than those required by objectives 1 and 2.
- The process should have been open and transparent; instead, it was completed in isolation by a small group working in secrecy.
- The level of oversight for socio-economic analyses should be the same as for the biological basis of the strategy.
- The assumptions made in the analysis may not be the best ones. A more in-depth analysis is required to look at a range of outcomes. The analysis' outcome is probably within the range, but may be at the extreme end.
- The Team cannot send a letter to the public registry; that is beyond our mandate. We can send one to the RDG, who appointed members to the Team. The response should be more general and less inclusive than the document prepared by Departmental members of the Work Group.

Action: The Chair will prepare a draft response to be considered by the Team during a conference call to occur later in the week.

Sweltzer Project

Bruce Clark provided background information regarding a project proposal to replace a bridge on Sweltzer Creek that is required to address a public safety issue related to the Soowahlie gravel pit.

Project Funding Proposals

The Chair provided the Team with the proposals received for consideration for Departmental *SARA* funding. It is not yet clear whether the Team will be required to review and rank the proposals, or whether it will be done by the Chair.

Attachment #2.

**MEETING NOTES
CULTUS SOCKEYE RECOVERY TEAM**

**Conference Calls
November 19, 2004
11:00 to 12:00 and 2:30 to 2:45**

Present:	Mike Bradford	Bill Gazey	Rob Morley
	Bruce Clark	Jeff Grout	Neil Schubert
	Michael Folkes	Frank Kwak	Ken Shortreed
	Jim Gable	Don MacKinlay	Chris Wood

Alternates: Nelson Kahama

Guests: Brian Harvey

During the morning session, the Team discussed the “straw-dog” response to the proposed listing decision that was prepared by the Chair. We agreed to changes in the document and its reformatting as a letter to the acting Regional Director General. After completion of the changes, the Team again met in the afternoon to discuss final changes. A full consensus was reached, and the Chair sent the letter to the RDG at 3:07 p.m. (attached).

Attachment #3.

Cultus Sockeye Recovery Team
c/o 100 Annacis Parkway, Unit #3
Delta, B.C. V3M 6A2

November 19, 2004

Mr. Paul MacGillvray
Acting Regional Director General
Pacific Region, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
401 Burrard Street
Vancouver, B.C. V3C 3S4

Dear Paul:

This letter is a consensus document produced by the Cultus Sockeye Recovery Team. The Team was formed under the authority of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to advise him on the recovery of the population. Membership, which represents a broad spectrum of disciplines and interests, is based on expertise related to the technical and biological aspects of the recovery of Cultus sockeye.

On October 23, 2004, the Minister of the Environment posted on the *Canada Gazette* an order proposing that Cultus sockeye not be listed under *SARA*. We recognize that the socio-economic review is beyond the mandate of the Team. However, after reviewing the available socio-economic documents, we have concerns about the biological assumptions upon which the analysis is based and the process by which it was produced. This process did not include consultation with the Team on the validity of the biological assumptions in the analysis.

The Team has concerns about how biological modelling was used to estimate the economic impacts of listing Cultus sockeye. This is an obvious area of competence of the Team given its scientific and technical expertise on this species, as well as its detailed knowledge of the recovery goals and objectives and the actions that are planned or underway to achieve them. The Team has developed a peer reviewed biological model designed to evaluate the response of the population under differing recovery options that include a full spectrum of environmental and management scenarios. In our view, the failure to engage the expertise of the Team in the biological modelling has resulted in significant shortcomings in the socio-economic analysis.

The Team concludes that the socio-economic analysis fails to consider the full range of recovery actions, including but not limited to flexibility in fishery management actions, that are allowed by the Recovery Strategy. It presents only one of a wide range of possible outcomes and provides little context or analysis for how realistic the outcome might be relative to other scenarios. The analysis has a narrow and short term focus that is in contrast to the Recovery Strategy, which explores all facets of recovery and is focused on long term recovery benefits.

The analysis does not allow a comparison of the economic costs and benefits of a variety of other possible, reasonably contemplated actions that would allow the recovery of the population.

In light of the above, the Team respectfully provides two recommendations. In the *short term*, the details of this socio-economic analysis of the impact of listing Cultus sockeye should be thoroughly reviewed by the appropriate biological and technical experts and made available for public comment before the proposed decision is finalized in January. The review should ensure that the analysis encapsulates the full flexibility of options that are allowed by the Recovery Strategy and that it is consistent with an understanding of the biology and recovery of the population.

In the *longer term*, the Team believes that the process for providing socio-economic advice for the recovery of COSEWIC-designated species needs to be reconsidered. Carefully considered action plans need first to be developed before an informed socio-economic analysis can be completed. Recovery teams and their implementation groups should be engaged early to ensure consistency with strategy goals and objectives and with recovery actions that are planned or underway. Socio-economic analyses should also undergo the same level of oversight as recovery strategies and action plans, with full peer review and public consultation processes that provide adequate time for sober consideration and written feedback.

Yours truly,

Neil D. Schubert, Chair
for The Cultus Sockeye Recovery Team

Attachment #4.

Cultus Sockeye Habitat Team

Cultus Lake Lab

-

November 9, 2004

Participants: Jeremy Hume, Bruce Clark, Mark Johnson, Ken Shortreed, Doug Wilson, Frank Kwak, Dave Barnes, Brad Fanos

Start 0945

Welcome and Introductions: Frank Kwak is new to the group, welcome

ACTION: Invite John Heinon to join Habitat Team

Projects 2004 / 2005

Pikeminnow – verbal update from Jeremy, rough population estimate 20k – 100k

Winter capture to assess feeding habits, starting tomorrow

Frank considering organizing an April Derby to supplement capture

ACTION: Check with Jim Roberts, re: Pikeminnow retention

Net trapping – a need for new nets which have less potential to “gill” small fish

Milfoil – verbal update from Brad, strategic removal plan in development, partner with Cultus Lake Parks Board, Lindell Beach Residents, BC Parks, DFO playing a coordination role plus putting in some seed money

Cultus Parks will prepare proposal and submit to Bruce and Brad for processing

Planning on winter removal in non sockeye spawning areas

Brad will explore possibility of MOU development to facilitate approval for future years

Habitat Assessment – verbal update from Brad, milfoil distribution and man made material – final report due out any day

ACTION: Mark will distribute electronic copy when he receives it from Brad

Groundwater analysis – Lindell Beach and Spring Bay, water temp., DO, substrate typing, milfoil in greater detail, John Heinon will be looking into groundwater properties at Lindell Beach

ACTION: Brad will forward John's workplan

Meeting with Cultus Lake Parks Board and DFO – verbal update from Bruce

Issues included Frosst Creek, lake level during different seasons (small Committee struck to address),

ACTION: Dave will keep the Cultus Lake Parks Board aware of DFO concerns

Hatchery Creek concern – Dave and C&P monitoring sediment / turbidity problem

ACTION: Dave will bring Al Jonsson back into loop

Enhancement – Dave gave verbal update, holding 25 brood, 87 total return (50 in lake), 4 marked fish have returned, Egg take – Nov. 16th

Proposed Projects – 2005 / 2006

Adult assessment – intense monitoring, predation problem

Smolt assessment – same as in past years, mark recovery

Freshwater improve survival – juvenile assessment, biophysical assessment, pikeminnow

Potential fence modifications to ease fish passage

Habitat Stewardship Program (HSP) SARA

Soowahlie has applied to do creel survey work again next year

Sport Fishery Awareness

Concern over adipose clip returning, need to educate sport fishers who are targeting returning marked coho. Need for communication, perhaps greater enforcement.

ACTION: Work with Devona/Anne-Marie and Jerry Spencer – City of Chilliwack for possible signage, pamphlet, potential key location Peach Rd. and Lickman Rd., tackle shops. Keep Glen informed – Mark
Talk to creel survey people to determine the need for information

Awareness Table

Mark notified group of SARA proposals submitted by Diane Lake (DFO Communications) and Theresa Southam (DFO-HEB Education Coordinator). Both projects were well supported.

Group reviewed draft Awareness table and decided on priorities.

ACTION: Mark will begin the process to design and coordinate signage project with partners. Team will review draft signage when it's ready.

Potential project – re-vegetate outlet to lake (Sweltzer Creek) and restrict access to swimmers

Issue / opportunity – number (growing) and lack of education of recreational fishers, solutions related to enforcement, greater education, DFO coordination and provincial, “flossing” problem

High School Students – potential work

- Planting
- Derby assistance
- All About Fishing Fair
- Beach clean ups
- Mentoring – elementary school kids

Next meeting: To Be Determined, Feb – March 2005

Potential New Awareness Projects

Project Title	Target Audience	Key Partners	Cost	Potential Benefit	Comments	Priority
Information Sign Kiosks - 1 main sign plus 1 for fishers	lake visitors / swimmers recreators / walkers sport fishers	Cultus Lake Parks Board, Provincial Parks City of Chilliwack	\$ 12000	Raise awareness of lake visitors. Give fishers more detailed info regarding fish identification, regs. – need good pictures.	May be able to get financial assistance from both parks groups and city for specific signs. Locations suitable – Main Beach lake outlet, parks. Vedder Bridge, Peach, Lickman	highest
Cautionary Signage	Lake and creek recreators and residents	Cultus Lake Parks Board, Provincial Parks	\$ 2000	Goes directly to critical habitat issue. Sweltzer Creek lake outlet	There are locations on the lake which provide critical habitat for the Cultus sockeye. Strategically placed signage will caution people on their behaviour in these most sensitive areas.	highest
Audio/Visual Presentation	All About Fishing Tradex fishing, Summer park visitors, local students, Park staff	Cultus Lake Parks Board, Provincial Parks, Chilliwack School District, Soowahlie Indian Band	\$ 2000	An active way to get message through to people. Could adapt talk to use with various groups. Broad benefits.	CA and other trained volunteers could present, depending on audience. Needs to be engaging, striking images.	high
Newsletter / pamphlet	Local residents, businesses, visitors, campers (hand out at park check-in booth)	Cultus Lake Parks Board, residents, Coast Guard, FVRD, Provincial Parks	\$ 2000	Will give people details on recovery process and a better idea of what they can do to protect habitat, i.e. proper boat fueling techniques and sustainable living	May be able to complete and distribute a couple of issues a year and focus on the hot issues surrounding sockeye recovery.	high
Public Forum - 2005 or 2006	Locals	Soowahlie Indian Band, local ratepayers association	\$ 1500	Gets information directly to the local people interested in sockeye recovery process.	Two community workshops have been held. It's important to follow up with this type of communication as the two past sessions were well attended and it gives people an opportunity to get updated on recovery actions and to give feedback.	medium
Portable Display	Locals and visitors, presentation	Easy to put together a simple one using posters	\$ 0 or	A portable display would help educate people about specific activities related to	Panels from consultation process could be used as a starter.	medium