
PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meetings

In preparation for the PNCIMA forum, March 26th and 27th 2009

Skidegate, March 2nd

Masset, March 3rd

Prince Rupert, March 3rd

Kitimat, March 4th

Port Hardy, March 5th

Canada 

**North Coast – Skeena
First Nations Stewardship Society**

**Coastal First Nations
Turning point Initiative**



March 20th, 2009

Table of Contents

Summary Overview	3
Context.....	3
Commitment to the Process	4
Engagement.....	4
Process Design	6
PNCIMA Forum.....	7
Provincial Role	7
Conclusions.....	8
PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Skidegate	9
Participants	9
Hosts & Presenters.....	10
MEETING NOTES	10
Welcome and Presentation	10
Group Discussion and Questions.....	12
PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Masset	27
Participants	27
Hosts & Presenters.....	28
MEETING NOTES	28
Welcome and Presentation	28
Group Discussion and Questions.....	31
PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Prince Rupert	46
Participants	46
Hosts & Presenters.....	47
MEETING NOTES	47
Welcome and Presentation	47
Group Discussion and Questions.....	50
PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Kitimat	63
Participants	63
Hosts & Presenters.....	63
MEETING NOTES	64
Welcome and Presentation	64
Group Discussion and Questions.....	65
PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Port Hardy	75
Participants	75
Hosts & Presenters.....	76
MEETING NOTES	76
Welcome and Presentation	76
Group Discussion and Questions.....	77

Summary Overview

PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meetings

Skidegate/Masset/Prince Rupert/Kitimat/Port Hardy

March 2-5, 2009

Summary Overview by Andrew Fulton, ADR Education: Facilitator

Context

In preparation for the initial Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA) Forum the PNCIMA Steering Committee asked for a series of meetings to be held within the PNCIMA region. These meetings were designed to encourage participation in the PNCIMA initiative, provide information about PNCIMA, engage stakeholders in discussions about their vision, goals, challenges and issues within their region and get insight into how stakeholders would like future engagement to be developed. In addition, it was hoped information arising from the meetings would assist in the development of the PNCIMA Forum and provide a foundation upon which to build at the event.

Meetings were scheduled for Skidegate, Masset, Prince Rupert, Kitimat and Port Hardy. Due to mechanical problems in transportation some members of the team facilitating the meetings in Skidegate and Masset were unable to attend. Attendance at the meetings was approximately 18 participants in Skidegate, 18 in Masset, 50 in Prince Rupert, 14 in Kitimat and 35 in Port Hardy. The meetings were based on an agenda designed to be flexible enough to adapt to the needs and desires of each community where it was held. Ultimately, each meeting was successful in delivering on the objectives in different ways and in accordance with the desires of the participants.

This overview precedes the individual detailed notes taken from each meeting. A summary of common themes among the meetings is presented as well as pointing out particular issues or ideas expressed. It should be noted that this summary reflects more the input of the participants than the responses of the presenting team and is based on the notes provided, the facilitators' flipcharts and the sentiment or atmosphere perceived within the comments and the meetings generally. The minutes of the meeting will provide a more detailed and comprehensive description of questions and responses.

Commitment to the Process

Considerable concern was expressed and questions asked in all the meetings around how committed the Federal Government was to a PNCIMA Integrated Management process. This apprehension was stated as a need for clarity around an expected timeframe, funding, resource capacity and evidence of PNCIMA being a Federal, and in particular a Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), priority. A number of participants stated they supported the idea of the PNCIMA initiative but were sceptical and hesitant to participate until there is clarity on this commitment, such as longer term funding, a defined vision of success or a political statement of support.

Distrust in DFO was a dimension that enforced the need for the participants to see commitment. With DFO being the lead Federal agency and past processes, decisions and experiences noted as reasons for concern many participants expressed need for clear leadership as a means to displace the scepticism and distrust. Overall the participants want to see commitment from DFO which mirrors the commitment of the people who will be involved, working in and ultimately affected by the process.

Commitment was also questioned with respect to follow through on any final plan. Although legislation in the *Oceans Act* and Oceans Strategy supports the process, participants wondered what assurance they may have after dedicating their time and resources that any agreed upon plan would be implemented, referring to the completed but unsigned Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Initiative as an example.

Engagement

One of the objectives of the preparatory meetings was to begin to formulate ideas on what an effective stakeholder engagement strategy may entail. At the center of this discussion was how to achieve representational fairness given the size of the area, the diversity of sectors and stakeholders' varied ability to be involved in light of resource, time and funding reasons. A number of participants identified the need to be involved in designing the engagement strategy due to these concerns. A fear that the better funded sectors would drive the agenda was noted as well as concern how the engagement could be sustained over the long term for sectors where consistent representation was difficult to maintain.

The role of the Steering Committee, Secretariat and "advisory groups" was unclear for most participants. A specific question was how stakeholder input

would be represented at the decision making level, with concern by many DFO would denote their voice. In all the meetings the role of local and regional governments were identified as a possible linkage for integration, particularly for residents not represented by First Nations. This sentiment supported the desire for the engagement process to be centered in the communities echoing one of the values common at all the meetings. Statements along the lines of “if you want our input you will have to come to the communities” illustrated this point.

First Nations who have not signed an MOU with DFO reflected on how representation and engagement would occur for them. First Nations have a different relationship with the Federal Government than other stakeholders. It was pointed out this relationship is protected in the constitution and based on aboriginal right and title as confirmed in the courts. All those First Nations who are not part of an MOU identified the need to be consulted outside of Coastal First Nations-Turning Point Initiative or North Coast Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society and many expanded on this obligation as a need for those leading the process to come to the First Nations communities and talk with the people.

Participants also questioned how existing advisory processes could be integrated into PNCIMA to avoid duplication, re-inventing the wheel and process fatigue. On the other hand participants identified the need for a process that is creative and unique which considers the character of the region.

A vision for PNCIMA was seen as a priority in the process. Participants felt starting from a common ground with a vision of what success will look like is needed to consolidate what is currently seen as a complex and amorphous process. Discussion on this issue also included questions around what the final product of the process should be and the timeframe to get there. Although some participants recognized that generating the vision was tied to stakeholder engagement there was also scepticism about the scale of the task and desire to have DFO take more of a lead in defining those expectations. There were a number of values and principles expressed in each meeting that may ultimately inform the vision for PNCIMA. These included, for example:

- Need for people to come to coastal communities to understand them
- Connections to the coast are part of the coast
- Acknowledging the people who depend on the coast for life and livelihood
- Hope to utilize local and traditional knowledge
- An educational process
- Interactive communication
- Need for the plan to be implementable and enforceable

- Adaptable plan – a living document
- Fair and equitable representation
- Sustainable participation

Born out of dissatisfaction with the way the preliminary meetings and PNCIMA Forum were communicated and developed, suggestions were made that a better communication strategy be adopted. This strategy would be synonymous with engagement. Communication is needed that is not only transparent and accessible but educational to those living and working on the coast. The communication strategy was described as being capable not only of providing needed information and evaluation into the region but being able to utilize and share information from the region. Ultimately this strategy is anticipated to make engagement an interactive activity.

In relation to the need to see commitment to this process and for DFO to show leadership the participants would like to understand the “roadmap” for where PNCIMA is headed. The roadmap would need to include access points, a vision, stakeholder engagement, and anticipated steps or markers along the way.

Process Design

There were significant comments on the contemplated process for PNCIMA. Everyone recognized that representational fairness, developed in the stakeholder engagement strategy, would be critical to success. Many of the questions about the process were focused around how existing regulatory bodies would function as the plan was being developed. There was both a concern that a moratorium on activity may occur or that the process may not be flexible enough to address new activity. Conversely, participants feared while the plan was in development there would be competition to “grab as much as you could before it was gone”, and similarly that the plan would only then apply to activities after the process was complete. This discussion led to questions of how enforcement and policing could be incorporated to ensure that implementation had some teeth.

The scale of planning was uniformly questioned and although the rationale based on oceanographic and marine ecosystem considerations was provided, concern over the large size, diversity, complexity and associated difficulties in planning at a human scale were noted. Similarly, participants were interested in how existing processes at smaller scales could be incorporated and inform the PNCIMA plan.

Overall there was an acknowledged need for this process and the resulting plan. Although many participants were concerned over aspects of the logistics and capacity to succeed there was seemingly unanimous support for the concept of creating and utilizing an integrated management plan.

PNCIMA Forum

The decision to hold the PNCIMA Forum in Richmond on March 26 and 27, 2009 was criticized at all meetings. Although there was some recognition of the logistical benefits of holding the forum in Richmond, most felt the message it sent mirrored their concerns of the initiative being driven from Vancouver and Ottawa. Although there was an appreciation that funding for travel is being provided there are also time and logistical considerations that may hinder representation from some sectors due to the location. These conflicts were identified as competing conferences, inability to participate during the weekdays and time away from local activities that need to be monitored. Some expressed the Forum should have been in North Coast communities to stimulate economic activity, catalyze discussion in the region and promote education around PNCIMA.

The communication of the Forum and the preparatory meetings were also seen as deficient, particularly the perceived haste in their development, the fast approaching date of the Forum and lack of awareness and advertising.

However, in all the communities there was some expression of the importance to attend the Forum to ensure local voices were represented. The Forum is being watched to deliver on commitment, vision and leadership. Expectations were that the Forum should model how the PNCIMA initiative will progress.

Provincial Role

The Province of British Columbia's full participation in PNCIMA was understood to be vital by most of the participants. Given the terrestrial connections on the North Coast and the Province's jurisdiction over activities affecting the people and ecosystems, participants identified an expansion of the Provincial role early in the process as critical to success in the PNCIMA Initiative. As British Columbians the participants are anxious that their representation will be diminished without meaningful involvement by the Province. Although the participants understand that the Province has been involved as an observer and there is hope they will fully participate, some were concerned that their present status is a sign of a flawed process.

Conclusions

Five preparatory meetings held in Skidegate, Masset, Prince Rupert, Kitimat and Port Hardy provided important input into the Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Initiative (PNCIMA) and Forum planned for March 26 and 27, 2009.

The development of a stakeholder engagement strategy needs to have fair representation, create a vision and have a transparent and effective communication strategy. Furthermore, the participants felt the engagement needs to come to the region and communities.

There was significant concern among meeting participants about the process and DFO's commitment and ability to lead the process to a successful plan. Many participants were hesitant to be involved until they understand that commitment, how their voice will be represented in decision making and what a roadmap to success will look like. Some expressed apprehension at the scale of the process and wonder how planning and integration at a human scale may happen.

A need was identified by First Nations who have not participated in a MOU with DFO to understand how their representation will occur. Ultimately, these First Nations need for consultation to happen within their communities. Similarly, there was hope that the Province of British Columbia will become a full participant in the process rather than an observer as many feel their representation is served through Provincial, Regional and Local governments.

In contrast to the criticism of the location and timing of the PNCIMA Forum there was also acknowledgement that participation in the Forum is important for the communities, sectors and people living and working in the North Coast. The PNCIMA Forum is the first step in integrating the varied interests of the stakeholders and will begin the process of visioning and designing a successful plan, which was acknowledged as a necessary initiative in the North Coast.

PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Skidegate

March 2nd, 2009, 6:30 – 9:00 pm

Skidegate Community Hall

Catered by Haala Ga Taa Bakeshop

Meeting notes by Lynn Lee, Haida Oceans Technical Team

Participants

Aileen Hans	Skidegate resident
Alvin Cober	BC Ministry of Environment, Queen Charlotte resident
Colin Davies	Area F commercial troll fisherman, Lawn Hill resident
David Unsworth	Logging and marine-related contractor, Port Clements resident
George Farrell	Hecate Strait Streamkeepers, Queen Charlotte resident
Gerry Leminski	Queen Charlotte resident
Jody Bissett	World Wildlife Fund Canada, Gwaii Haanas NMCAR Marine Advisory Committee, QC resident
Kris May	Commercial fisherman, Queen Charlotte resident
LaVerne Davies	Lawn Hill resident
Lindsey Doerksen	Area F Harvest Committee, commercial troll fisherman, Queen Charlotte resident
Lucy Stefanyk	BC Parks, Tlell resident
Melinda Pick	Haida Marine Work Group, Queen Charlotte resident
Nathan Ferguson	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Queen Charlotte office, Queen Charlotte resident
Pat Fairweather	Haida Fisheries Program, Tlell resident
Paul Pearson	Gwaii Haanas NMCAR Project Team, Skidegate resident
Peter Katinic	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Queen Charlotte office, Tlell resident
Ryde Harding	Haala Ga Taa Bakeshop, Skidegate resident
Terri Walker	Skidegate resident

Hosts & Presenters

Catherine Rigg (CR)	Council of the Haida Nation Haida Oceans Technical Team
Coral Cargill (CC)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Prince Rupert Oceans office
Lynn Lee	Council of the Haida Nation Haida Oceans Technical Team
Russ Jones (RJ)	Council of the Haida Nation Haida Oceans Technical Team

MEETING NOTES

Welcome and Presentation

Russ Jones (RJ) – Welcome. Meeting is sponsored by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) and Council of the Haida Nation (CHN) Haida Fisheries Program (HFP). Other partners include Coastal First Nations – Turning Point Initiative (CFN – TPI) and the North Coast Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society (NCSFNSS). Other DFO staff and facilitator were supposed to be here tonight but plane did not arrive from Vancouver. Coral Cargill from DFO Prince Rupert office and I will be chairing and presenting tonight.

Welcome to Skidegate Community Hall. Good to see people again, including many who were at the oceans forum here at the end of January. Others from CHN and HFP are working here as well. Peter Katinic who now works for DFO is taking notes at the meeting. Lynn Lee is also taking notes. Catherine Rigg at the back is part of the Haida Oceans Technical Team.

Background information about the process. CHN has been involved in the initial stages of marine use planning (MUP) for last 2 years. We have a Haida Marine Work Group meeting and talking about concerns about ocean and how things might be done better. Last Dec (2008), agreement was signed with CFN-TPI (CHN part of that group) and DFO, starting the public side of the Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA) MUP process. Some of the things we have done include the oceans forum in January. This is just one of the initiatives related to planning in northern BC in the PNCIMA. Other initiatives going on include the Gwaii Haanas National Marine Conservation Area Reserve (GH NMCAR), and land use planning with BC and CHN talking about planning in the nearshore area. This PNCIMA process focuses on the big picture – all of northern BC. On the CHN side, some of the projects include the Haida Marine Traditional Knowledge (HMTK) study – interviews with Haida fishers and elders.

This information will be available for use in this process and is useful local information that is often not available from DFO and others places.

In terms of the agenda tonight, we have covered items 1 & 2 and are on item 3. Coral will go through the presentation on the PNCIMA process – background on what's happening, what to expect over the next little while and how to get engaged in the process over the next while. This meeting is preparing for another forum in Vancouver at the end of March. These discussions will help prepare for the PNCIMA forum. Three questions for you are around engagement, values and issues. We may do some breakout groups so we have more time for discussion, followed by a quick summary of what was talked about in different groups, and then talk about the forum at the end of March. Feel free to ask questions as they come up.

Stakeholder comment: Slide show will give us an overview of PNCIMA. That's the first I've heard of PNCIMA – lots of the reports are dated for 2006 and 2007 so it's not new, but certainly new to me.

RJ – That's the background information – work done in advance, but may be other information that is also needed.

Why are we here? Preparatory meeting to get ready for March forum. Organized by PNCIMA Secretariat which is a group of organizations – Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) is leading, Environment Canada (EC), Parks Canada (PC), Natural Resources Canada (NRCan), Coastal First Nations – Turning Point Initiative (CFN-TPI), and North Coast Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society (NCSFNSS). We are facilitating this process. I live here, Coral is from Prince Rupert, and we are probably doing more locally in terms of organizing these kinds of meetings.

Purpose of this meeting is to give you more information about PNCIMA, talk about 2 concepts – integrated management (trying to do things more collaboratively, involving more organizations so you don't miss out on something important) and marine spatial planning (zoning like for Gwaii Haanas – some areas where some uses not allowed, others multi-use areas, different uses in different areas). We are talking about potential for marine spatial planning (MSP) for all of northern BC throughout PNCIMA. Also want to hear how we can better engage with communities, fishing communities, any organization that might have an interested in outcome of MUP.

Group Discussion and Questions

For March forum, for people who cannot get down there, how will they let people know what happened at the forum?

Coral Cargill (CC)– A post-forum proceedings will be developed. That and other materials will be available on the PNCIMA website. This is an ongoing process so there will be lots of opportunity to be involved and lot of information. Also planning to live broadcast the forum so you can follow along. www.PNCIMA.org is the website.

RJ – There is also limited amount of travel funding available from DFO to go to the forum – will talk about that more at the end. Funding important particularly for representatives of groups with strong interest in the outcomes or to bring information back.

How to handle/coordinate jurisdictions between BC and feds? Between federal agencies and their BC/fed counterparts?

RJ – Is a challenge that will need to be discussed.

CC – Some challenges will be covered in presentation – can come back to it later if you have more questions.

RJ – Also want to talk about your values and principles and also the issues you are concerned about.

No microphone in here – hard to hear. Question asked – we discussed this a while back before Christmas, this new PNCIMA setup. A few years back, tried to do co-management with DFO and players in the fishing industry. Lots of good ideas put forward and went for a while – would hate to see that go to waste. Would like to see that brought forward again for information in this process so that it is not lost. Is this going to be any different? Are we talking to the wind? Somebody has to accountable for all the energy that gets put into this – otherwise it will fall on deaf ears again (that means DFO). We can't go on again for nothing as has happened in the past with DFO. Have seen it time and again,

wasting a lot of energy. A lot of heated discussion about a lot of things between DFO and user groups. Is this the same thing with a different name? *If we do this thing, it needs to be an on-going thing, then they need to make funding for it and continue with it.*

RJ – Will have to judge for yourself whether it is different or not. We will go through the process in the presentation first.

There are good people in DFO but they are told what to do from Ottawa – they go after the 5-year old kid, not the lodges. Need Ottawa to support this process and make sure it moves ahead.

RJ – These meetings are a way to bring people together to talk about what's important to you. Some of the issues talked about here could be brought forward at the forum in March. I encourage people to participate – travel funding or video conferencing. If there is interest in video conferencing, we need to know in advance to organize.

Are going to kill a lot of trees with all this yakking.

CC – Extend apology – I came from Prince Rupert on the float plane and then got a message that the lead presenter from Vancouver and facilitator had to go back to Vancouver because the plane had mechanical problems. Apology on their behalf and also apology for senior managers that could not be here. Mel Kotyk (senior level Pacific Region Oceans – 2 levels under Paul Sprout), Steve Diggon (CFN-TPI), Anna Gerrard (notetaker), and Andrew (facilitator) were supposed to be here.

Coral Cargill's presentation:

- *PNCIMA map – description of area, Canadian version of Alaskan border.*
- *One of 5 areas chosen as Large Ocean Management Areas (LOMA) – East Coast Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) was the first LOMA initiative and almost entirely stakeholder driven. On Pacific, stakeholders are not driving the process.*
- *Everyone can agree there is a lot of use conflict in the Pacific region. Illustration of all the different uses, users and potential conflicts. DFO came to realize that there must be better way to manage the area rather than single species and single issue.*
- *But oceans governance is very complex and there are lots of fingers in the pie. Lots of regulatory bodies with individual rules and regulations/processes.*

- *PNCIMA governance framework was signed on Dec 11, 2008. Canada started working with First Nations on the BC North Coast. The Lead First Nations groups are NCSFNSS (Tsimshian Nations primarily) and CFN-TPI (including the CHN and Central Coast Nations). Part of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) created a steering committee to oversee the process, as well as a secretariat. PC, EC, NRCan all sit on the secretariat – one of the primary focus areas is stakeholder engagement, part of why we are here today.*
- *Map illustrating some of the activities in the PNCIMA. GIS data representing actual areas where activities are taking place. Some idea of how space is used in PNCIMA. Demand for ocean space far exceeds the available area.*

Is any of this the same as what Gwaii Haanas is using in their Marxan analysis?

CC – *Not sure.*

Are those exploratory well?

CC – *Yes, they were drilled 40 or so years ago – are still there.*

Coral's presentation continued:

- *First step is to assess the area once the boundaries established. Background work done. Now engaging stakeholders in how you want this area to look like. What kind of planning process do you want to see? Fisheries, industry, aquaculture, all part of PNCIMA and can nest within the PNCIMA process.*
- *Russ talked about zoning and that's one part. Also about management and collaborating together. Once we get a plan together, need to implement and monitor that plan together.*

How far along is the ESSIM process?

CC – *Their first forum was in 2002 so they are a few years ahead. It was their fishing industry, offshore oil and gas industry and coastal communities driving the process. Process was about deep-sea corals and concern about dragging impacts. Cod was a concern but not the only concern.*

When you talk about draggers and different fishing practices. When draggers were bringing lots of fish in, everybody was happy and there was lots of work at

the processing plants. Now they are down to bare rock and no fish, affecting corals. We said this would happen years ago, but nothing was done. You are asking for our input but embarrassing to be involved when all your advice is overlooked. Whatever we discuss here is going to PNCIMA forum in Vancouver – but then where do we go from there? Is not a big group here as a whole. If you are asking for our input, ask us what we think. PNCIMA planning is the new thing – we are facing the same issues that we have been talking about for years. We should have discussions from previous meetings presented here because coastal areas don't all think the same or fish the same. We need to plan this together, not step on each others toes.

CC – One of the big challenges is to take into account all the different opinions.

For example, the pollution. We tried to show that 30 years ago, the pollution that came in. Fish farm warnings went unheeded until just recently. The biggest fish farm owner worldwide is in Norway – he is being shut down in Norway because of their huge pollution issues. That's why they are here in Canada now – we are a big dumping group for them and for ocean liners. Fall on deaf ears as far as DFO concerned – what are we doing talking about what's happening in our industry? Seven million sport fishers compared to a few commercial fishermen so our concerns fall on deaf ears. When talking about a new integrated management plan, everyone should voice their opinions and see what will be done.

RJ – This is starting point for this whole discussion. Like the land use plan (LUP), there need to be lots of discussion about how to do planning before the process starts. Coral going through how it's supposed to work and then can discuss whether it works for others.

CC – Presentation continued:

- *Assessing management area – big pile of paper killing many many trees – part of it is looking at ecological data, marine use data, species distribution. If there are not enough copies of the reports and you really want one, please contact me.*
- *Putting together a PNCIMA atlas showing ecological and human use data – should be a draft for PNCIMA forum in March.*
- *Oceans part of DFO will have to work in conjunction with all the other groups and processes to link efforts for MUP. First Nations community planning, GH NMCAR, Bowie Seamount/Sgaan Kinghlas Marine Protected Area (MPA), MPA areas of interest for sponge reefs, coral and sponge areas, and the BC Marine Conservation Analysis (BCMCA).*

- *The PNCIMA forum is on March 26 & 27, 2009, in Richmond, BC. Will be a big challenge but part of process is engaging – goal is to discuss issues, opportunities and challenges for PNCIMA, and seek input from stakeholders for how to build process into the future.*
- *There is some travel assistance for people to go to Vancouver. PNCIMA Secretariat at www.PNCIMA.org. Go to website, link on side for travel. Short timeframe to request travel funding by March 9th – DFO has to book tickets. Email info@pncima.org or call 604.666.2873.*

Inappropriate to have people from PNCIMA area travel south to Vancouver for the forum. Just a thought – odd to have outside the planning area.

CC – This has been brought up and others know it is an issue. We have a sheet of 3 questions – looking for input on those today. Will be lots of opportunity for input on this and other issues.

Can you provide background information on what has happened on the east coast? What sort of measures of success? How much progress and commitment from DFO to that process? You say you want it to be driven by the stakeholders, but right now this process is driven by the feds.

CC – DFO and First Nations on the west coast are driving the PNCIMA process right now.

RJ – On the east coast, they are dealing with a different set of issues. Actually were 5 LOMAs announced at the same time. ESSIM one. Beaufort Sea another and they have moved along quite quickly. ESSIM has not done zoning yet, so even though they have been at it longer, they have not got to the zoning part yet so we are not that much further behind. Here, the most important part is to get all the groups and organizations that have an interest to start off on the right foot.

Seven years from now, will be a lot of change and issues we are talking about now may not be relevant. Seems like they have not done a lot over 7 years for ESSIM.

Wondering if they want this to be stakeholder driven – is the government already saying that they will back this process once it gets going?

CC – I cannot personally promise, but know that the people working on this are very committed to making this happen. They came out with the Oceans Act and then Oceans Strategy within the last 10 years – this is a new concept in government altogether. Takes time to change things. With Oceans Act, is a big commitment. Fisheries Act has been around for many decades.

Oceans Act commits them to developing integrated management plans for the 5 pilot areas. Other thing Oceans Act does is commit to a network of MPAs throughout Canada. We have an opportunity to do this for the Pacific north coast.

I am involved in a couple other advisory boards – Gwaii Haanas Marine Advisory Committee (GH MAC) and commercial fishing. Concern about long-term funding commitment with PNCIMA as an entity on its own. In the middle of working on an integrated troll fishing management plan. PNCIMA is not part of that work. *How is PNCIMA going to fit into the existing bodies that already exist on the coast?* Overlapping issues – Rockfish Conservation Areas (RCAs), MPAs, GH NMCAR, DFO rockfish conservation commitments (protection of 20% of rockfish habitat). I see different government bodies reaching for the same goal and don't know how much communications there is between them. *How committed is DFO and do they have a budget to continue? 3 year plan? 5 year plan? Timeframe for achievements?*

RJ – I am in same situation you are – I don't work for DFO. Was funding to do this at one time with the Oceans Action Plan. At the end of that, expected funding to continue. But then a new government and new oceans initiative – Health of the Oceans (HOTO) – came along and it is more related to protected areas than integrated management and the PNCIMA process. But we are in the same situation – we want to clarify the process and next steps.

For example, you (Russ) know how much work it is to get funding from DFO for Pallant Creek fish food. We struggle to get \$30,000 for DNA sampling each year. *I want to know there is some commitment to this before we spend a lot of time and effort on it.*

RJ – Oceans does have some funding committed to different projects in oceans. On CHN side, DFO has committed to our participation in this process. BC is not participating but we are hoping that BC will engage on this in the next few months because they are an important part of this too with tenures and coastal developments.

Do you personally see the Oceans Act as having enough backing within DFO to support this PNCIMA process?

RJ – Once there is an integrated management plan in place, it is DFO's responsibility to implement it. Collaboration is required of a number of different agencies – is an uncertainty. The Minister of Fisheries needs to bring all of his/her authority to make this happen, but so do the other ministers with ocean-related responsibilities.

What is the involvement of the province on the east coast?

RJ – DFO is moving ahead with this. It took over 4 or 5 years of discussion to come to this agreement – hope that the province will participate but DFO has the authority to collaborate with other groups to make this happen even without the province. Province participated in our forum and made a presentation. They are participating but not necessarily committed to the process yet.

The PNCIMA management plan – oceans forum got me and others thinking about tanker traffic – would this document be the one that specifies guidelines for tanker traffic – eg, escorts, double-hulled, etc.

CC – One of the first issues PNCIMA is trying to tackle is shipping and transportation through the transportation and shipping work group – on hold at the moment but hoping to deal with those issues through PNCIMA.

Before someone comes in wanting to take over tanker regulations, we are liable to end up in court, because of the free trade agreement.

In summary of issues brought forth – general flavor – *people are concerned about the investment of our time and our ideas without government response and commitment to the people.* Every government body that could donate funding needs to do so – maybe that would give me more faith. Want to know if there is a collaboration among different fishing groups – you speak as if they were unified, and that would be great, but I don't think that's the case. Could there be some forum specifically for them to get all their concerns out on the table? Unified values and concerns among fishermen may be possible then.

Spoke to this earlier and glad it was brought up again. Who's got the power/authority – Oceans Act or Fisheries Act? Vital to making this work – this is going to go on for how many years – all of a sudden, we find out it's not what we

thought. This is said from years of experience dealing with fisheries. Some of the most powerful people in government are in charge of fisheries. Any meeting we have, the agenda is already set – we don't know what the outcome is going to be, but they do. For example, when they knew they were wrong in the Broughton Archipelago, they said they were panned fish and therefore provincial. But that's crock, it is fisheries' responsibility. You can pin it down now and say it's the Oceans Act, than I am more comfortable with it. If it goes the other way with the Fisheries Act, will go the other way – they will control the ocean.

In terms of the shipping act, we are a 5th world country – some of the boats used in other places have lots of stuff that people are worried about here taken care of. Here, is a big escort tug bringing vessels into Prince Rupert port.

RJ – Shipping is a good example of where things that can be improved and you have brought up a good example of something that is being done.

Now I have to go to school to run the boat I've been running for 50 years. Need to go to school to be a deckhand. That's the new rules.

RJ – The plan may happen in a year, maybe 3 years – we know that if we don't start looking at some of those issues now, problems will be worse. Might be better to look in an integrated way at all the issues and how they affect one another. Want to point you to the handouts that outline what the process might look like.

PNCIMA Initiative Overview handout:

- *Review of summary document, including purpose and objectives and process overview. Focus on the process diagram.*
- *MOU between federal government and First Nations for PNCIMA governance. Rebecca Reid is senior person from DFO. Arnie Bellis sits on the steering committee for Haida Nation. Other First Nations and federal agencies are also involved in the steering committee. The Secretariat has reps from the same organizations as on steering committee – Avril Lamont, Coral Cargill, Kelly Francis, Russ Jones, and others conference call every 2 weeks or so to deal with activities like the PNCIMA forum. This is a way of resolving differences and making decisions similar to the LUP process.*
- *Underneath the PNCIMA Steering Committee and Secretariat, shows how organizations, groups and individuals can feed into this process. For example, could have shipping issues – would get together a working group that would include DFO, Transport Canada, ferries, port authority,*

shipping associations, geographic areas, etc, and those people would get together and discuss challenges, opportunities and solutions.

- *The LUP table was a consensus based table – this would be another way of doing it, with working groups focused on different issues. Could have forums like the PNCIMA forum, or area-based forums or topic- based forums, to talk about PNCIMA issues. ESSIM had 3 forums over 5 years. We could have annual forums or more or less frequent ones – up for discussion.*
- *Could also have stakeholder advisory committees – as plan is developed, these smaller groups may work more regularly with the steering committee and secretariat to work through some issues.*
- *Other idea was to use existing advisory boards, like Lindsey mentioned, to feed into the PNCIMA process. Things that come out of PNCIMA process could go to existing advisory groups for feedback and comment.*
- *Are there other ways people would like to see engagement in this process? What kind of stakeholder engagement process would work with you? Can you see yourself in these ideas or some other process?*

Is this process diagram just a proposal to start some sort of group?

RJ – The government to government process between First Nations and the federal government is now signed with the MOU and that framework is all in place. If BC gets involved, they would be part of the steering committee and secretariat.

CC – What's up for discussion is the stakeholder engagement part of the diagram.

See existing advisory bodies on the list – know that PNCIMA and GH NMCAR have been talking. But have not heard from the Area F Harvest Committee about any conversations between that group and PNCIMA.

CC – That's the mechanism that we are trying to get to. Want to hear how you see your concerns as part of the harvest committee get fed into the PNCIMA process.

RJ – That is a question for industry to answer. How does industry see itself feeding into the process? Are 3 questions – one about engagement, another about key elements in PNCIMA vision, and the last about key issues for

PNCIMA. Have a choice – could split into small groups or have large group discussion.

Why does it go down to Brooks Peninsula and QC Strait, and not include the whole coast including Vancouver Island?

RJ – Oceanographic reasons, but fairly arbitrary.

Is there a plan for the south coast included in PNCIMA?

CC – Not at the moment.

Obvious that how the land goes affects what happens in the ocean. Seems to me that has to be integrated into the picture. Do you see that happening?

RJ – From CHN perspective, see that happening.

Do you see that link with land use as something that will be part of the PNCIMA agenda?

RJ – If you ask me as part of the CHN, I would say yes for Haida Gwaii. If you ask Coral, Oceans Act only covers the ocean and the plan that DFO develops for integrated management may be more general than the Haida plan. Coastal plans are part of the province's interests and if they get involved, we may get more coastal planning scale discussions.

If you cut it off at Cape St James, almost half the area is Haida Gwaii.

I am on advisory committee for GH NMCAR and I know it's different, but for the NMCAR, the goal is to have approximately 30% protected area – is there something similar for PNCIMA?

CC – Not at this point – the outputs are partly driven by the participants in the process, so there is no pre-determined outcome at this point.

RJ – That’s also what the second paper is about – the executive summary. Talks about what a plan might deal with. Lists the kinds of issues that PNCIMA MUP may deal with. Also list of opportunities – room for discussion, for example, development of recommendations for an MPA network. Varying opinions about whether that should be part of this plan or not. In the last year, senior officials are thinking that MPAs should be part of the integrated management process. That’s one of the things stakeholders can comment on now.

Happy to see point 4 where it is, but would like to see point 5 further down.

Because of Ottawa focus on wild fish – does Ottawa want to see an economic bottom line, or series of reports, or what? *What are they (Ottawa) looking for that would help them make a further commitment to the PNCIMA process?*

CC – Very good question but can’t answer today.

Ottawa can’t see over the Rockies.

RJ – Seeing Ottawa as controlling this is not accurate. This is opportunity for you or Lindsay or others to get engaged and let Ottawa know what you want to deal with. Showing interest and support for the PNCIMA process is what may be the most effective at this point. Gentleman at the back mentioned that what happens on land affects the ocean so need to bring that as a key message too.

PNCIMA as it exists right now then does not have specific goals in mind. Waiting for feedback from this and other meetings/forums to set those goals. Is this or another time the place for input on issues? Or not? I have some real issues seeing all the shellfish aquaculture applications. Problem is – is this a step towards opening up finfish aquaculture on Haida Gwaii? I know where the CHN stands, but I don’t know where PNCIMA stands.

CC – PNCIMA does not have a ‘stand’ – it’s an area.

But will be issue up front for any integrated management plan.

RJ – We know that some here will not be at the forum, so this is the place to express concerns like that.

I don't think there is a moratorium in place for finfish aquaculture. There is a moratorium in place for fishing lodges but we know how effective that is – in fact, there is a lodge moving from Tasu to Nesto. I have a fear of DFO as a commercial fishermen – nothing DFO has told me has been true. Breath of fresh air to go to GH MAC meetings because it's different than DFO processes. Don't get me wrong, support this process but not sure how it is going to be done in DFO.

I have been disappointed with fisheries for over 30 years too – one bright light is Oceans Act. If they are looking at this with a different perspective than there is hope – but maybe that's just a hope and a prayer.

Are the questions on this form also on the web site?

RJ – There were meant to be breakout sessions so encourage you to write down your comments or sent other comments later.

I was involved in fisheries and forestry issues on Vancouver Island. All they did was write a new set of riparian area regulations that were ignored just like the ones last year. Federal fisheries who had the overall responsibility for fisheries habitat were not even present to speak to it, even though DFO was involved in Carnation Creek and knew of the implications of logging activities. There's a lot of good stuff that's already been done – maybe not in PNCIMA – but related to forestry issues, a lot of work exists that is not looked at. Let's use the data that is already there.

I'm going to have a look through all this – is it possible for PNCIMA to become an act? Is that a potential goal? If so, can it be a governing body that's above all the existing agencies? A PNCIMA mini-agency? This is really a huge broad initiative.

CC – Cannot answer that question. You are right that it is huge.

RJ – That is something that could happen, but don't think that's what the federal government is thinking. They are working within existing regulations and acts. Maybe an integrated body can work to implement a plan. That has to come out of the plan – from an agency perspective, seems to be resistance to that kind of change.

Even with current rules and regulations in the province, are many ineffective things that are not working. If we are going to change this to implement PNCIMA, will need to change the ineffective structures as well.

Great job creation effort for the bureaucrats – need another 1,000 more and they can build another tower in Vancouver for them.

RJ – We have had some people talk about some issues. Not much discussion about the vision end of things.

DFO has had their kick at the can and they cannot have the final say in this. DFO needs to become a smaller player and others need to make decisions.

There needs to be more local input. We live here and can see what is happening in our backyards.

RJ – Opportunity to make some changes in this process.

The line should go down into the southern border with the US. Not going to do aquaculture in any place that's not safe – things like that. One good thing about Haida Gwaii is it's still not poisoned. A lot of other places in this world are poisoned. It can still come back here if we can stop and bring it back – if there is the political will, that could happen here.

We need to make this relevant to those who are not dependent on coastal community economics. Transfer those values to those who are not immediately affected. For example, fish prices will increase because things are more difficult, waterfront property will increase because of degradation. *Need to communicate and make outcomes relevant to everyday people.* How it affects consumers. *That is needed to generate support for the process and outcomes.*

Most people in the city think that a cow comes out of the cooler at the store. How are you going to make them think about where their fish comes from?

RJ – Important question – how do you engage people who are not at this meeting? For example, after the oceans forum, MLA Gary Coons was in legislature. 9 of 10 people in BC think oceans are important – how do we take those views and get people to participate? This is an opportunity, but need to get people to engage and take action rather than just have an opinion.

Coastal communities in the area – small coastal communities – have paid the ultimate price in all BC and federal economic plans. There was some economic stability and jobs for a while but now they are virtually gone. EC and DFO fighting against BC with the fish plant issue at the moment, but fish waste dumped is going down in volume compared to the past. Now three local fish plants may be shut down because of lack of communication. *One of PNCIMA's roles could be increased communications between agencies and between feds and BC.* Hopefully this can be a light on the horizon and something can come out of it. Whether the three fish plants stay open or not is going to make it on the radar at the PNCIMA forum, but for us it's huge.

This should not be an issue – that stuff should go back into the ocean in Massett. In Queen Charlotte, maybe give it to a crab boat and dump it out in Skidegate Inlet – it may be a problem all at the Queen Charlotte dock, but not scattered through the inlet. Maybe it will improve the crab fishery.

We do have some new blood in DFO (local office) and that may be good. Old ones all left before the new ones started.

RJ – We're going beyond PNCIMA issues now.

Meetings like this are important. I am disappointed that more people didn't come out.

Please take extra food home!

Catherine Rigg (CR) – PNCIMA Forum document overview (handout):

- *If you are considering going to the PNCIMA forum, there is travel support, although limited. Handout gives you a good idea of what they are planning to address at that meeting. Have brought in a number of speakers to present at the forum. Similar structure to the ocean forum here with setting the stage section at the front, followed by discussion of issues, opportunities and challenges presentation based on longer version of the summary here. Following is Rick Steiner talking about citizen involvement in marine planning and management.*
- *In the afternoon, Elliott Norse, well-known marine conservationist, will be talking about what has worked in other parts of the world, followed by breakout groups.*

- *Stakeholder engagement is a tricky thing – government cannot just say how it will work without backlash – here trying to balance that by hearing from stakeholders about how they would like to be involved in the process. Stephanie Moura from US east coast and Mike Weber from California will talk about innovative ways to involve stakeholders. Afternoon will talk about what information is available or not available for the PNCIMA process, including some of the background information DFO has brought here.*
- *This is the first public engagement opportunity for PNCIMA. It is not coming off cold – there is a mountain of work from the last 2 to 3 years to inform discussions about PNCIMA, pre-planning work. CHN has also been really involved trying to pull together information for Haida marine territory to inform Islands' process. This is an opportunity for Islanders to become involved, and for building partnerships with the other communities, similar to the LUP process.*

RJ – Thanks to Cathy for the overview. If there's something you want to see happen, you need to say so. Final comments or questions?

You keep talking to about the LUP, but local people were no longer involved once at the government to government process. We have the Haida government and BC government, but they do not represent me. *I would like to see lines of communications left open in this process, including the Haida Nation, for everyone on island to be able to speak their opinions. So long as the advisory processes are open to everybody, I will be happy.*

If I send comments to the website, where will it go?

CC – It will go to everyone on the PNCIMA Secretariat. There is a contact email on the website and your comment will be addressed by the person who is most appropriate.

RJ – Thanks to everyone for coming out on a Monday evening. This meeting has been useful for me and others. Reminder that there is food at the back that can be taken home – please do.

CC – Apologies for the lack of people who were supposed to be here.

Meeting adjourned at 9 pm.

PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Masset

March 3rd, 2009, 9:30 am to noon

Masset Community Hall

Catered by Haida Rose Café

Meeting notes by Lynn Lee, Haida Oceans Technical Team

Participants

Allan Wilson	Haida Marine Work Group, Haida Hereditary Chief, Old Massett resident
Barry Pages	Village of Masset, Masset resident
Beth Guptill	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Massett office Conservation and Protection, Masset resident
Bill Beldessi	Council of the Haida Nation Land Use Plan Implementation Team, Sandspit resident
Chris McDougall	Council of the Haida Nation Haida Mapping, Tow Hill resident
David Smith	Haida Marine Work Group, Old Massett Village Council, Old Masset resident
Debbie Beemer	QCI SeaPak fish processor, Masset resident
Errol Winter	Gwaii Trust Society, Masset resident
Harold Yeltatzie	Haida Marine Work Group, Old Massett Village Council, Old Massett resident
Jason Majore	Old Massett Village Council, Massett resident
Joanne Collison	Old Massett resident
John Currie	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Massett office Conservation and Protection, Masset resident
John Disney	Old Massett Village Council Economic Development office, Masset resident
Reynold Russ	Haida Marine Work Group, Haida Hereditary Chief, Old Massett resident
Robin Brown	Old Massett fishermen and resident
Terry Hamilton	Old Massett Village Council, Old Massett resident
Tim Fennell	Logging and marine-related contractor, Port Clements resident
Urs Thomas	QCI Sport Fish Advisory Board, Golden Spruce Motel, Port Clements resident

Hosts & Presenters

Catherine Rigg (CR)	Council of the Haida Nation Haida Oceans Technical Team
Coral Cargill (CC)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Prince Rupert Oceans office
Lynn Lee	Council of the Haida Nation Haida Oceans Technical Team
Tim Delange (TD)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Prince Rupert Oceans office

MEETING NOTES

Welcome and Presentation

Opening prayer by Allan Wilson.

Reynold Russ – Welcome each and everyone here. Important things are happening here. Don't be afraid to say what you have to say. So many bad things are coming towards us and we have to block that somehow. The only way to do that is to work together.

Catherine Rigg (CR) – Run through agenda so everyone knows what's happening. A team of 5 people were supposed to come up here including Mel Kotyk, DFO Oceans Vancouver higher level senior policy person. To their credit, DFO listened and were prepared to send him. But the plane got turned around yesterday so we are on Plan B filling in. I am the socio-economic planner for Haida Oceans Technical Team (HOTT), here with Lynn Lee, the biologist planner, and Chris McDougall, our GIS Analyst.

We work with the Haida Marine Work Group (HMWG) that started in 2006. AW, RR, HY and DS are all part of the HMWG. The HMWG has been meeting monthly since 2006 to discuss Haida marine use planning (MUP), compiling information about Haida Gwaii waters, fisheries and other marine uses. This is timely, coming out of the land use planning process (LUPP) and many of you also attended the January Haida Gwaii forum. This meeting and the Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA) forum are the public launch for PNCIMA. The Council of the Haida Nation (CHN) has been involved in MUP for

Haida marine territory and we are working with the North Coast and Central Coast First Nations (FNs) to develop marine use plans for all of PNCIMA.

Some HMWG activities include development of the CHN Marine Strategic Plan in 2007, and the subsequent document, Towards a Marine Use Plan for Haida Gwaii, published in Haida Laas. You can contact Lynn or Cathy for more information locally at the Haida Fisheries Program (HFP) office in Old Massett. CHN sponsored Gaaysiigang, an ocean forum for Haida Gwaii, along with Gwaii Haanas (GH), Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) and World Wildlife Fund Canada (WWF). HFP also initiated the Haida Marine Traditional Knowledge (HMTK) study in 2007 and this project is ongoing, interviewing people from Massett and Skidegate about their marine use, knowledge and involvement in marine activities. The HMTK report is scheduled to be completed at the end of this year. We also have a Haida Gwaii market sector analysis in progress – looking at different marine use sectors to value their contributions to Haida Gwaii. What kind of local benefits do we get or not get? What are emerging industries and where might we invest in the future?

Arnie Bellis is the First Nations Governance Committee (FNGC) representative for the Haida Nation for PNCIMA MUP. The process is complicated but I wanted to give everyone background information for today's meeting. On Dec 11th, 2008, a collaborative governance framework memorandum of understanding (MOU) was signed between DFO and Coastal First Nations – Turning Point Initiative (CFN-TPI) office (CHN is part of this group) and North Coast Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society (NCSFNSS) – primarily Tsimshian Nations. The MOU basically says that we are all going to work together to enable PNCIMA discussions to move forward. This is a first public meeting related to the PNCIMA process. These are preparatory meetings leading up to the PNCIMA Forum in Richmond. Because the forum is in Vancouver and not in PNCIMA, there will be travel support for some from the north coast to attend. Coral will be providing more information on the PNCIMA forum later in her presentation.

The MOU sets up a steering committee and a secretariat – bodies that will work to implement the PNCIMA process. From the CHN perspective, it is important for the islands community to be engaged and involved in this process, and having input about how the process will be designed and implemented. There will be future meetings on-island hosted by the CHN. This meeting has been primarily organized by DFO with CHN assistance because we feel this is an important first step. The organizations represented on the steering committee and secretariat include Parks Canada (PC), Environment Canada (EC), Natural Resources Canada (NRCan), DFO, CFN-TPI, and NCSFNSS.

Review of agenda. By the end of this meeting, we hope you will have a better understanding of integrated management (IM) and marine spatial planning (MSP). We also hope to promote stakeholder engagement in the PNCIMA process as much as possible, and get a sense of the key issues and concerns that you may have about this process and for the area. This meeting is leading up to the forum in Vancouver and we hope that people will go to the website to

get more travel information. In this meeting package are three background documents: (1) PNCIMA initiative summary, (2) Issues, challenges and opportunities executive summary, and (3) PNCIMA forum package. Coral will give you a presentation with PNCIMA background. Please jot down questions as you think of them over the presentation – will be plenty of time for questions later. We are not going to do breakout groups due to the facilitator not being here and the relatively small group here. We will instead work with the three guiding questions that are located on the feedback form. DFO wants some of the process design to be stakeholder driven for PNCIMA, not just to come and tell people how it will be done – balance between government saying how it will work and having people tell government how it would best work for them. Issues and concerns is the last question – we heard a lot of concerns expressed yesterday at the meeting in Skidegate. Coral works for DFO Oceans in Prince Rupert – she is Mel Kotyk for today and will be presenting on the PNCIMA process.

Coral Cargill (CC) – Apologies for Mel who was supposed to get here yesterday. I am here with Tim Delange from DFO in Rupert as well. I have a background presentation about PNCIMA – you will notice that the process does not have defined outputs as we hope to have input from communities about what the outcomes will look like. PNCIMA – sounds like a disease – but is acronym for an area that extends from north end of Vancouver Island to the border with Alaska. The Oceans Act of 2002 promised the implementation of Large Ocean Management Areas (LOMAs) and integrated planning systems.

Slides of ocean uses and conflicts – species at risk, bycatch, pollution, and biodiversity issues are some of the many issues that need to be addressed in PNCIMA. There is general consensus among government is that some process is needed beyond single issue resolution. Need a broader range of solutions that can more comprehensively address all the complex and interrelated issues. Lots of conflict and confusion exist across different agencies and their jurisdictions. The Oceans Act requires the minister of fisheries to lead the process, but asks for all the other federal agencies to work with DFO to deal with ocean related issues. PC, EC, NRCan and DFO sit together for the government of Canada. For First Nations, there is CFN-TPI (including CHN) and NCSFNSS (primarily Tsimshian Nations). The MOU established a steering committee and secretariat to guide this process. Input from stakeholders including coastal communities is a key component of this process.

Map showing some of the activities in PNCIMA and where they occur and overlap. These GIS data layers are part of a PNCIMA atlas that is being drafted for the PNCIMA forum. They give you a sense that the demand for ocean space is pretty high and that is one of the motivators of coming together to use the Oceans Act for area-based integrated management. We can manage groundfish trawl on its own, but that does not deal with other uses of the same space. Same with shipping traffic – effects on other uses are not considered if the issue is not dealt with in an integrated manner.

PNCIMA planning slide – First step was to assess the PNCIMA management area. Step 2 is to engage interested parties and that's why we are here today. This is the 'coming out' of the PNCIMA process and we are looking for input from the public, to take your input and find out where stakeholders want to go with this process. Your input will feed into plan design, implementation and feedback to the communities and other stakeholders.

Assessing the area – Some of the results of these assessments are the reports out front that are available for you, and these will be background information to inform the process. We want that information to contribute to the plan. There are other initiatives underway that need to be linked and nested within the PNCIMA planning process. These include First Nations community planning, the Gwaii Haanas National Marine Conservation Area Reserve (GH NMCAR), the Bowie Seamount/Sqaan Kinghlas Marine Protected Area (MPA), the sponge reef areas of interest for MPAs, coral and sponge areas and the BC Marine Conservation Analysis (BCMCA). We need a plan where all these initiatives are integrated and not just single processes.

The PNCIMA forum in Richmond is a first step to engaging the larger BC stakeholder community related to PNCIMA.

Group Discussion and Questions

You are having a north coast forum in Richmond? Isn't that why we have all our problems – lack of common sense?

Coral Cargill (CC) – One of the reasons is that no matter where the forum is held on the north coast, someone will have to travel.

Tim Delange (TD) – For Port Hardy and the central coast communities, travel to Vancouver is easier than on the north coast. The next forum might be in a north coast location – not all will be in the lower mainland.

CC – There will be travel funding to attend the PNCIMA forum.

It's not just the money, a lot of time is needed for travel down south so it's hard for someone like me to attend.

Is the travel funding confirmed?

CC – Yes, there is funding for travel. Go to the PNCIMA website and there is a link to go to travel support. With the time constraints, we needed to expedite things so travel assistance applications need to be in by March 9th.

I have registered to go already, but the deadline for registration is March 15th.

Maybe you could make that information available to us – who made the decision to hold the forum in Vancouver? I would like to know.

CC – I will find out and get that to you.

ACTION ITEM: Coral to find out who made the decision to have the PNCIMA Forum in Vancouver and get that information out.

Suggest that you change the location of the forum – you should have the forum in Prince Rupert. They have space in Prince Rupert and even here at the Haida Heritage Centre.

I disagree with having the forum in Vancouver. Even today, decisions affecting us are made down south.

You should start this process off right. It is a problem that the forum is not on the north coast. Otherwise, don't bother consulting us. It would be economically beneficial for the north coast to have forum up here as well – spend the money here. But I am not representing any particular group or organization so what I say has no clout.

Catherine Rigg (CR) – Your opinion is important and it is shared by many others. These opinions will go back to DFO.

All the problems I see here are related to the fact that local people are not part of the decisions that affect us. In Ottawa or Victoria or wherever – we can't participate in any of the processes because they are happening down south and do not reflect what is happening up north.

At a recent meeting in Vancouver with main Sport Fish Advisory Board (SFAB), a PNCIMA presentation was given as well.

If we're not going to have it here, you might as well include Hawaii and Fiji as potential places for the forum so we can go somewhere warm.

Concerned that no speakers' names are associated with agenda. Concerned that discussions do not get distorted in reporting back to DFO.

CR – Lynn is taking good notes for this meeting and for the one last night. Explanation that the people from Vancouver really did try to come up – the plane took off from Vancouver and had to turn around. This situation is not by anyone's choice.

In order for this to go ahead smoothly, we need someone to chair this meeting.

CR – I can chair the meeting. Last night, Russ was chairing and I am taking on that role today.

Good points and issues have been brought up already. Very little representation from the north at meetings down south – regardless of whether we have 1 or 10 votes from up north, we essentially have no votes. Haida Gwaii is very diverse in many aspects – in people and resources – and we end up not having much of a sway in anything. Government steps in and makes decisions without us. Lots of natural resources were on-island and someone other than locals has taken over control of those resources. How do we get to what we want on Haida Gwaii – great to plan and decide how much you want where, but need to go back to local people on the island, not just leave it on a piece of paper. Otherwise the resource will just be depleted. Need to have a lot of say in what happens to the islands – need to use the knowledge that's here more effectively.

CR – You're right. Important to remember that there is a Haida Gwaii scale of planning that we are locally very involved in. Then there's the PNCIMA scale that is larger. Different issues will be relevant at different scales. For example, PNCIMA issues might be climate change and shipping. CHN is focused on Haida Gwaii MUP and that one place where local involvement will be very important and effective. Bill Beldessi is here working on the LUP and the lesson is that we need something locally supported and locally driven. The CHN knows that and is hearing that. Need for opportunities that are local to be recognized and local people to be engaged in those discussions and decisions.

Recommend letting Coral finish the presentation.

CC – I'm pretty much done – this is the last slide.

Realize that our HMWG deals specifically with Haida Gwaii. I was referring to the PNCIMA area where the meeting is happening in Vancouver. But we still don't have representation there from this part of the world. Need to change so the islands have more representation than we have now. Gets worrisome after awhile because others are making decisions for us that affect us.

Whole principle about this new governance process is that there is some degree of local input and local control. If we are to believe that, the first step is to consult people on the north coast about where they would like to have the forum. If you had asked, people would likely have said on the north coast. Now, there is no point getting involved in that because the decision has been made for Vancouver.

Interesting to hear everyone talk about this. Tim Fennell brought up some very good points on participation. All of us have been witness to participation over the years – just look at industry now – salmon declining, herring almost gone, hard to get k'aaw (fortunate that boys in Skidegate managed to get some and share with us). Many things are really true – boys in Ottawa only enforce what's been brought to them. Noticed decline in just about everything – local people have noticed. Participation of people from Haida Gwaii and the north coast in these processes is almost nil and that's why there's so much decline in marine resources. When you look at our clams and other fisheries, just about the same thing. Must be a lot of under the table stuff going on in Ottawa. Soon they will be reporting that we don't have any herring and crab anymore in Hecate Strait. Then they will be asking if we can open up Hecate to oil and gas drilling. Tim's ideal about local participation is a big thing.

The CHN is making an attempt to do local planning with the HMWG – lots of work has been happening. Just go to the office and look at how much work has been compiled – we are trying to see what we have left. I can really feel the concern about having the PNCIMA forum in Vancouver. We all have to travel and take time out – the locals are stuck between a rock and a hard place. Those in DFO that come here are stuck because they have to do what they are told. Problem with our Haida Guardians – they have no enforcement authority – they can only take down names and catches. I can do that too.

Participation is a really big thing – even if the forum is in Vancouver, we can make it work for us – apply for travel funding and test it. Go to be involved. I was bitching about it too but it's in the process and everything is set up. We should beat them at their own game and take advantage of the travel funding and participate.

Why not have it here and contribute to the north coast economy?

CR – That sentiment will be clearly communicated to the organizers.

TD – We all recognize that this situation is not ideal.

Everyone agreed that the PNCIMA forum should have been planned to happen on the north coast.

This is a really simple point. If we cannot get input on the simplest of issues, we will not be able to have real input on the complex issues.

CR – In the design of the stakeholder engagement, we can take that feedback for future forums. One thing that has been done in recognition of the poor decision – there will be video conferencing on the web and that can be set up for those who want to participate that way.

But what about north coast economy? Can I make a suggestion that the same amount of funding that is being put towards the PNCIMA forum be put towards north coast conservation initiatives?

Why is DFO involved anyway? We warned everyone that there would be problems years ago and now DFO trying to fix things. Disagree with us being involved with the whole north coast – people on the mainland do not always agree with what we want to do on Haida Gwaii. We should just do our own thing. Why are we getting involved with them – we should be separate. Every time DFO gets involved, they have all the say and we sit around and don't get anything out of it. I don't agree – we should be independent and do our own thing on the island.

CR – That sentiment was also expressed at last night's meeting in Skidegate.

Welcome to Barry Pages. We didn't have many local government participants at the January forum on-island. Good to see you here. In my opinion, the stakeholder does not have any say – we are just turned into another advisory body. I have worked with DFO on advisory processes for many years and been very frustrated. We may have local input but when that gets to Ottawa, things get turned around. Would like to see process where locals have some say in what happens.

CR – Important issues have been raised: (1) location of key events, (2) process locally to allow people to become engaged, and (3) level of stakeholder

engagement beyond advisory capacity. These are important points to designing a process that people have some faith in.

I have trouble putting value in this system. I see EC and DFO as key players in PNCIMA. As a fish plant operator, we have been basically shut down due to **no dumping of fish waste**. As far as we know, we are the only ones on the east coast and west coast that are being shut down. Look at all the sewage being dumped from the communities straight into the ocean. We talked to Nathan Cullen who talked to the fisheries minister – we now have an extension to operate until the end of May or June, but then we will be shut down. It's wrong on so many levels. Now that the decision has been made, they cannot go back on it without looking bad, so I am having trouble taking this seriously. Also the Vancouver forum decision – not a lot of faith in this process.

We have been dumping fish waste back into the water where it belongs for thousands of years with no detrimental effects. This is about some farmer making decisions for Haida Gwaii. Boggles my mind that they can do that and not even come and talk to us about what kind of effect we have on the ocean with this. They are making gas from wheat or grain – not able to help with our fisheries. Even if the PNCIMA meeting is in Richmond this time, encourage everyone who can to go to it – get that money and make them pay for it. I am frustrated by this conversation because it's already in the works. We can have a vote here, but will not change anything. Go to this one and see what you can do for the next one. Correct, they are having it in a place that is not connected to us – decisions are being made for us, but have to get our foot in the door and beat them at their own game. Let's get down there, listen to what they have to say, and kick some butt. That's all we can do.

I also have some specific issues and concerns as well. Don't want to put up problems without solutions. Some of the issues I've brought up over the years and recent ones.

Treated wood issue. Permanent toxification of the environment with the treated wood – no reason for it. We have clean non-toxic wood available (local cedar). Do not need treated wood for structures that are above the water. We have some data that this is toxifying some of the bottom. We do not need to use it. We have local wood that works just as well. You can extend the life of cedar decking with salt watering if needed, but this is a serious issue and the simple solution is not happening.

Lead in the marine environment. An estimated 30 to 50 tonnes of lead is going into the coastal waters here. Can use steel weights for fishing – do not need to use lead. Do not know what happens to it in the marine environment but we do know large pelagic animals are full of lead. No one is testing the lead we are using for fishing gear. Probably 500 tonnes of lead is lost every year along BC coast. This is far more serious problem than wrangling over who gets what

fish. Solution is also simple – do not use lead weights. Deleterious substances are going into the marine environment. If we cannot eat the fish because they are too toxic, will not be any point arguing about who gets to catch it.

Log dumping issue. Vast areas of Haida Gwaii are ‘dead’ and toxified. Breakdown of woody debris on the bottom causes aerobic conditions to turn to anaerobic conditions. Solution there simple too – debark wood before watering or load directly onto barges. We do not need to continually add bark debris to the bottom. Propose solution for area that are affected by bark already – oxygenate the surface layer so it can rehabilitate. Solution simple – load logs directly into barges or peel them first. There is room at the existing log sorts to do that on land. Peeling would provide value added product as well. Remediate ‘dead zones’ as well where wood is not breaking down.

No fishing zones around kelp forests needed. Often see kelp next to fishing areas coated with weights. Prevent boats from chopping up kelp and helps mitigate lead impacts. There are lots of other issues I could raise too. Lots of people come from off-island and everyone drives through the kelp beds. Urchins are also a big problem – why not concentrate urchin fishing adjacent to places that are very productive so kelp forests can thrive? Enforce a traffic zone out there and allocation urchin fisheries where kelp forests needed – simple solutions.

CR – That is something that could be part of a MUP and that can be brought forward.

Does anyone from DFO know how much toxic substance is being dumped into the ocean?

I need clarification. Are we here to talk about the PNCIMA process and how that can be set up? Or get into individual issues?

CR – There are three questions for discussion. Both those items are part of this discussion. Just letting people comment as they see fit. Some are interested in different aspects of PNCIMA planning. Issues brought up by Tim and Debbie and key issues important here and for other parts of the coast. Very relevant comments to what we are doing for Haida MUP.

I would like an answer from DFO about how many tonnes of lead go into the ocean every year.

I didn't think this was the place to talk about each issue and try to find solutions.

Realize that there are expectations, but conversation going around the table is offering solutions. Nothing is going to materialize magically.

CR – Review of the PNCIMA governance structure diagram from PNCIMA Initiative Overview. EC, PC, NRCan, and DFO are represented on the Federal Interdepartmental Committee on Oceans Management – there are discussions with Transport Canada as well. Steering committee will set direction for PNCIMA – they are the ones who made the ultimate decision about the forum in Vancouver. First Nations pushed very hard to have the forum held in the north coast communities. Secretariat is operational and meets more regularly – biweekly – to work out day to day activities of the process.

Bottom of the diagram is where the stakeholder engagement activities are focused. The boxes along the bottom are the engagement ideas that have been talked about to date – there may be others that come up in this and other discussions. One option is working groups – eg, the transportation working group exists to talk about shipping related issues for the whole north coast. Right now projects are being dealt with independently from one another through the Environmental Assessment process. The working group intention is to look at all of the projects and their cumulative impacts on the north coast. Anticipated to be many other working groups for other PNCIMA planning issues. Second are forums like the PNCIMA forum. Third are advisory committees to review and advise on different issues. Fourth is existing advisory bodies that can feed into the PNCIMA process – like the SFAB that Urs is involved with. Those will still be in place and are a mechanism that can be used. Fifth box is ‘other’ for further input into how the stakeholder engagement process will be designed. CHN and others can send feedback to the steering committee about concerns and direction desired by coastal communities.

if I understand correctly, the blue box (steering committee and secretariat) is another level of governance from us. As a stakeholder, if I have an issues, it goes into the blue box and then where? Ottawa?

CR – To the Steering Committee in Pacific Region. But they may send to Ottawa.

In current process, my issues goes to DFO directly. In future, where will my concern go? To PNCIMA body and then DFO or where?

CC – That has not been totally defined at this stage.

CR – Is a critical question that we need to pose to Mel Kotyk. Fundamental to how their engagement will pan out.

ACTION ITEM: Coral Cargill to clarify and get information about where stakeholder concerns will go in the PNCIMA process – how will concerns be addressed and who will address them compared to the existing processes.

You have an advisory committee and also an existing advisory committee. Please explain.

CR – Existing ones are like the SFAB and those for commercial fisheries – way for DFO to get input from different sectors. One option is to have all the stakeholder groups together in a PNCIMA advisory body that sits together to provide feedback on PNCIMA issues – is one of the proposed options.

Have PNCIMA Steering Committee and Secretariat been set up yet?

CR – Yes, was an MOU signed in Dec 2008 and those bodies were set up as part of that MOU. The first thing that these bodies are responsible for is this upcoming PNCIMA Forum in Richmond at the end of March.

Who is involved in that (steering committee and secretariat) – is there a breakdown of the membership & representatives?

CR – We can provide that to you.

ACTION ITEM: Coral and Cathy to put together a list of members and representation on the PNCIMA Steering Committee and PNCIMA Secretariat.

Where is the secretariat?

CR – Remote meetings by conference call every 2 weeks.

Who selects who sits on these committees?

CR – The organizations involved appoint someone to sit on those bodies. For example, Arnie Bellis sits on the steering committee and Russ Jones sits on the secretariat for the Haida Nation.

Where does authority of these bodies come from?

CR – The Oceans Act enables this group to exist. But as mentioned in Skidegate last night, does not mean there are not opportunities to create new designations and bodies to enable governance and implementation. There may not be sufficient legislation to deal with some of those issues but will be varying opinions on the matter.

I would think that if a local body that has total agreement on an issue, that that decisions should have some authority on the force of law. The easiest way to make sure local input does not result in action is to muddy the waters and that's what's happened with all the processes I've been involved in so far.

Are the documents you handed out here on the website?

TD – Yes, are up on the site.

Just to let you know the kind of coordination that goes on in DFO, Mar 25 & 26 are the integrated halibut harvest meetings that Russ Jones is on as well and that conflicts with the PNCIMA forum.

What are the conflicts that we have in the process now for Haida Gwaii? Conflict between what is happening at this meeting and with Haida MUP discussions. Does this override what we have been discussion at HMWG meetings?

CR – That's up to the CHN to answer. If there is conflict over what happens for Haida Gwaii versus direction for PNCIMA, its' up to the CHN to bring that up in government to government discussions.

CC – Agreed. This process does not just come in and override existing legislation and processes.

We have very good professional staff (HOTT) that work very hard on what we have for MUP. Some of the things we have now need to be implemented/integrated into this PNCIMA process. We have a very professional team that works on that and I am proud to be part of it.

TD – Regarding some of the specific issues that Debbie and Tim have, one of the benefits of these meetings are to provide synergies between similar issues in

different areas of the north coast. For example, someone in Prince Rupert is looking for fish offal and cannot get it. She's trying to make fertilizer mixing it with wood waste.

I mentioned the same thing at the economic forum with Nathan Cullen. Fish fertilizes the forest and is of very high value. One of the potential areas that you can put the fish waste is in the forest if we cannot put it back in the ocean.

TD – I am bringing it up because that is one way to make money from it.

That is one of the issues we discussed – ie, taking the bark from log sorts and fish waste and making fertilizer. Need funding to start these initiatives. Let's look at the options to get rid of both in a productive way.

TD – Out of some of the processes, may be able to lobby decision-makers to make this happen.

The only lobbyists that are effective are high paid ones in Ottawa. Need more local say.

Recommend you write a letter to Ottawa to discuss concerns re: fish waste.

There is conversation going on with Nathan Cullen about it and they have been relatively helpful. We are using as our clout, the poor state of our economy – that is having an effect too. One of our proposed solutions is to have a reduction plant built. Possible to build and get funding but there is a problem with timelines – we are not going to be able to get it underway by the end of May.

CR – Bring discussion back to PNCIMA and agenda – talked about 'a' and 'c' of point 5. For 'c', executive summary paper has some issues listed on pages 2 and 3. Marine pollution issue is a good example – Tim's concerns about lead and treated wood. Fish offal issue is immediate and needs to be dealt with right away.

The lead and treated wood issues have long term impacts and the solutions are dead simple but they are not being made.

CR – There are a lot of other issues that have not been discussed yet including sport fishing. Emerging issues like shellfish aquaculture and wind farms area also issues identified by others at the January forum on Haida Gwaii. We would like to

get feedback from you about other issues before the end of this meeting. Feedback on PNCIMA engagement is good and we will bring it back. Let's look at other questions now.

Agreed that Haida Gwaii should be its own area/zone. At a recent meeting talking about razor clams, I asked 2 people on the technical committee if they had ever seen a razor clam before – NO. They had never been out to the beach nor seen a razor clam and they are making the decisions about those fisheries. Having a zone put in place with our own governments will make it easier for us to have a say over our own issues.

Thank you Harold – I have been looking to have this for a long time. How long will this PNCIMA process be in place?

CC – The Oceans Act that this falls out of was created in 2002. Followed by the Oceans Strategy. On the east coast, the Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) area has had 3 forums since 2002 and we hope that will be mirrored on the Pacific side. On the east coast, the process was really driven by stakeholders – they wanted to sit down and talk about ocean planning. On the Pacific side, we are at the beginning stages, but with the Oceans Act, there is commitment from the government of Canada to continue with this process. I have been told that there is a 3 to 5 year timeline for development of a PNCIMA marine use plan. There is commitment to having this be a stakeholder driven process, but the more people are involved, the longer the process will take. However, the end result will be better if stakeholders guide that process.

Fine and dandy but I have never seen them work especially if Ottawa is making the decisions. Sit in a meeting for 4 to 5 hours and they have made the decisions for us already. We have lived on this island for a long time and the fish waste went back in the water. Now some dumb-ass in Ottawa is making decisions to take the fish skeletons out of the water. When our people are very knowledgeable about what happens around the island – but they don't come and talk to us, talk to someone who's getting paid a lot but knows nothing about the islands. We used to have lots of seine boats and fishermen but now we have nothing and the white guys tell us we are bums on welfare. They give us DFO licenses to go fishing but who has control – DFO – not the Haida.

Concern that this process is already set up with steering committee and secretariat. Agree with Harold, most have not seen a razor clam – should be local representation. I am shocked that there is a process set up already – agree there needs to be a management process, but shocked that it is there already. Will not have teeth with no local input. People in glass towers with some token First Nations appointments. Don't know why I am even here right now.

When we had the presentation on PNCIMA down south too – people were shocked everything in place already. Who is funding the process? DFO? Budget?

CC – DFO is funding it. I cannot tell you what the budget is but can take it to Mel and Rebecca Reid and get an answer for you.

ACTION ITEM: *Coral Cargill will provide information about the budget for the PNCIMA process.*

TD – I heard some concerns from Steve Diggon of CFN-TPI – that lots of the issues and solutions will have to be local. Is recognition from First Nations that the planning process needs to be more local.

Is this a temporary board or organization?

CC – No, mandated under the Oceans Act – pretty forward thinking piece of legislation. Recognize that the Fisheries Act is an old piece of legislation and we need to do things differently. PNCIMA is one of 5 LOMAs mandated under that act. Because of that, collaboration with stakeholders is mandated under the Oceans Act and the government structure under that is required to make it work. There is commitment from the federal side and it is a legislation that we have to follow.

What happened in 2002 that it took this long to get to some action?

CC – There are other LOMAs that started before the west coast. East Coast ESSIM and Beaufort Sea LOMA started earlier. In the Arctic, they have moved further along than the Pacific Coast as well – the situation is different in each area. We have not had the same stakeholders pushing the agenda on the west coast as on the east coast of Canada.

That's because we do not have trust in the process and DFO.

Who are the stakeholders?

CR – User groups and individuals who use the area. Haida are functioning as government to government relationship with DFO in this process.

The thing is we should have all the say – it's our territory and we should have the say.

Increasing amount of garbage in the marine environment. Concern about the amount of garbage around the islands – 100 fold increase in plastic bottles, many coming from the recreational fishery. Very visible and obvious for many years. Legislators have the mandate and legislation to deal with it. Some lodges have switched over to the big bottles with cardboard cups for guests. Other form of garbage is just plastic – monofilament fishing line, plastic garbage bags in vast quantities. Fish boats for example are coming in from 2 to 3 week trip with only 1 bag of garbage – where did the rest go? In Europe they actually address that. Water bottle issue is simple to deal with. Change to less bottles. Let's clean up the beaches too and bring some money into the communities. Once the plastic is ground up into the beach, is a huge source of pollution. They are issues that won't go away for generations.

CR – Appreciate that you are bringing up problems and solutions/opportunities. In the paperwork, there is a form that you can write your answers and concerns and get them back to us. CHN as well as DFO will take copies of the materials for their own planning purposes as well. Last item we need to cover off – draft PNCIMA forum program document. For those that are interested, summary of 2-day events. Quickly, page 2 objectives and anticipated outcomes, page 3, different sections of the forum.

They are bringing in some speakers to make presentations – similar to the January ocean forum here with setting the stage section at the start with presentations from agencies, First Nations and local governments. Followed by a presentation from John Bones who has written a longer document about PNCIMA issues, challenges and opportunities. Rick Steiner will then talk about citizen engagement in Alaska. Afternoon of Day 1 is a presentation by Elliott Norse who is a leading marine ecologist with the Marine Conservation Biology Institute with wealth of knowledge worldwide. What is being done elsewhere in the world and what is important for here. Day 2 will look at the why and how of stakeholder engagement – 2 speakers – Stephanie Moura from Massachusetts and Mike Weber from California about the Marine Life Protection Act. In afternoon of Day 2, breakout sessions to talk about stakeholder engagement.

This is an opportunity for people to say this is what is not working for us as well as giving solutions and ideas – how can the process work better for all of you? CHN wants to see that for our local planning and to know how people would like to be engaged in this process. If you have any additional questions, you can ask Lynn or Cathy, and Tim or Coral. Lynn and Cathy are in the Old Massett HFP office and Tim and Coral are in DFO Rupert office.

Masset, March 3rd

CC – If you can make it to the forum, please do. Keep March 9th travel application deadline in mind. A webcast will be broadcast if you cannot attend the forum in person. PNICMA forum proceedings will also come out after the forum and will be available on the PNCIMA website.

I'm voting for Hawaii with travel funding.

CHN was involved in helping to coordinate this. We would have preferred that the original plan was in place with team from Vancouver but appreciate that you have come out. We can commit to bringing your input to the HMWG meeting so locally it will be considered. Appreciate that everyone made the effort to come. CHN planning to do communications and outreach with the other islands communities over the next 6 to 8 months so there will be an effort to continue the conversation locally. As Coral said, this is the first step for the larger PNCIMA process. We are focused on Haida Gwaii MUP and that process is ongoing.

Are you aware of a recent study about acidification of the ocean – brought tipping point forward to 2030 – point at which ocean cannot recover. Hope we can do something in the next 20 years. Hope DFO is taking this seriously. Time to do something about climate change and quite a lot can be done.

Thanks. We will follow up and get a copy.

ACTION ITEM: *Haida Oceans Technical Team will get more information about the recent publication on ocean acidification rates.*

Closing prayer by Allan Wilson.

Meeting adjourned at noon.

PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Prince Rupert

March 3rd, 2009, 6:15 – 9:00 pm

Crest Hotel

Meeting notes by Anna Gerrard

Participants

Andy Cook	Prince Rupert Port Authority, Prince Rupert resident
Barb Faggetter	Ocean Ecology, Prince Rupert resident
Blair Stewart	Nisga'a Lisims Government
Bob Thompson	City of Prince Rupert, Prince Rupert resident
Caroline Butler	UNBC, Prince Rupert resident
Charles Menzies	Gitxaala Nation/UBC
Chrystal Hillier	Wainwright Marine, Prince Rupert resident
Cristine Soto	NCSFNSS, Prince Rupert resident
Dana Dirkson	Prince Rupert resident
Dave Prosser	Northern Troll, Prince Rupert resident
Dave Rolston	Prince Rupert resident
Des Nobels	T. Buck Suzuki E.F., Prince Rupert resident
Erica Rolston	MO and MLA Office, Prince Rupert resident
Eugene Gordon	Gitxaala, Kitkatla resident
Fred McKenzie	Kitselas First Nation, Terrace resident
Howard Masseur	CSCA, Prince Rupert resident
Jack Massalum	City of Prince Rupert
James Casey	WWF Canada, Prince Rupert resident
Jason Scherr	Archipelago Marine Research, Prince Rupert resident
Jen Rice	Prince Rupert resident
Jim Korpi	Chatam Sound Charter Boat Association, Prince Rupert resident
Joy Thorkelson	UFAWU-CAW, Prince Rupert resident
Kelly Sawchuk	Prince Rupert resident
Ken McDames Jr	Kitselas First Nation, Terrace resident
Kennard Hall	Ocean Ecology, Prince Rupert resident
Keri Taylor	Archipelago Marine Research, Victoria resident
Kirsten Barker	Gitxaala, Kitkatla resident
Kyle Clifton	Gitga'at, Hartley Bay resident
Larry Golden	Prince Rupert resident
Leslie Rowlands	Prince Rupert resident
Mabel Mazurek	NNFC, Prince Rupert resident
Mark Ignus	Gitxaala, Kitkatla resident
Mike Ambach	WWF Canada, Prince Rupert resident
Mike Stevenson	Smit Marine Canada, Prince Rupert resident
Nancy Paul	Northern Troll, Prince Rupert resident

Norman Dale	Eulachon Conservation, Prince George resident
Paul Paulson	Prince Rupert resident
Randy Wongkee	Prince Rupert Coast Guard - MCTS, Prince Rupert resident
Steve Robin	Prince Rupert Port Authority, Prince Rupert resident
T. Volcano	SQCRD, Vancouver resident
Tasha Sutcliffe	Ecotrust Canada, Vancouver resident
Ted Paul	Northern Troll, Prince Rupert resident
Terry Coutus	Kitseles First Nation, Terrace resident
Tom Sweet	CSCA, Prince Rupert resident
William Mounce	HBB Oysters, Prince Rupert resident

Hosts & Presenters

Andrew Fulton (AF)	Facilitator
Anna Gerrard	Note Taking
Bruce Watkinson (BW)	North Coast-Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society
Coral Cargill (CC)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Prince Rupert Oceans office
Mel Kotyk (MK)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Vancouver Oceans office
Steve Diggon (SD)	Coastal First Nations

MEETING NOTES

Welcome and Presentation

Welcome by Bruce Watkinson

Bruce Watkinson (BW) – What you hear today should sound familiar as many of us gathered in August 2007 and November 2008 to discuss similar issues: integrated values, balance interests, infrastructure, environmental values, jobs, etc.

This meeting is to discuss PNCIMA

Andrew Fulton (AF) – Went over agenda

Introduced PNCIMA

Today we would like to get your feedback and ideas on how would you like to be engaged, what you would like to see from the forum, and what your issues/interests are.

We have three questions prepared which will feed into the forum:

- **Stakeholder Engagement**

There are a number of ways to ensure that effective and meaningful stakeholder engagement occurs throughout the PNCIMA process.

What kind of stakeholder engagement process would work for you?

- **PNCIMA Values**

To ensure that the PNCIMA planning process results in an effective plan, it will be critical that we work together to develop a vision and objectives for this process.

What are some guiding principles and values that you or your group feels should be included in the vision for the PNCIMA initiative into the future?

- **PNCIMA Issues, Opportunities, and Challenges**

There are many issues, opportunities, and challenges that should be considered as part of the PNCIMA planning process.

What are your key issues, opportunities and concerns?

The answers to these will be incorporated into this process.

Mel Kotyk (MK) – The following PowerPoint is to provide context. The information here should not be new to any of you. We will be happy to take questions afterwards.

<Information given during the presentation that was not in the slideshow>

- Description of the PNCIMA boundary, how PNCIMA came about through the Oceans Act, and is one of a number of LOMAs in Canada
- There are lots of issues/diversity, interests, impacts in this area
- Many regulatory bodies are involved and this can lead to confusion
- We need coordination and integration of these regulatory bodies; DFO will coordinate this, as mandated under the Oceans Act.
- From court decisions, the federal government has a special relationship with the First Nations. The MOU outlines how the federal government and First Nations will work together for integrated management in PNCIMA.
- The previous slide(s) mentioned engaging stakeholders, but not all were listed. For example, there are also recreation, coastal communities, safety

- and security interests and much more. There are also other First Nations that are not members of the signatory groups.
- We are still the early stages of the PNCIMA process, where we are gathering data and talking to interested parties.
 - The assessment portion of the process involves scientific research.
 - Data from many come from many sources such as DFO, industry groups, commercial fishermen, etc.
 - Many processes are currently underway and these processes will continue.
 - For example, the Minister is looking to create a network of MPAs. These will all be integrated into PNCIMA and PNCIMA in turn will inform these processes.

The forum will be used to bring together interested parties to inform and discuss what marine or ocean planning is, who else has done marine planning and what can we learn from this. It will inform why PNCIMA has been undertaken, what the issues are and what the next steps are.

We will also:

- Kick off the development of an integrated management plan
- Discuss a vision
- Solicit input to assist in developing the process

Those with interests need to have a role before the design of the process. How can we design this to meet your needs?

Mel Kotyk (MK) described:

- The role of secretariat
- The draft agenda for the forum
- How to send questions into DFO through the Internet

The forum is being held in Vancouver for logistical reasons, but DFO will be offering travel assistance. The forum will also be web cast for those who cannot make it to Vancouver.

Today is the start, and there will be lots of questions that can only be answered through the process. Stakeholders need to articulate expectations and concerns and provide input for next steps.

Group Discussion and Questions

This is a large and diverse area. It would be better if we focused on more specific areas. Come through Prince Rupert and concentrate on the North Coast. We will not have input relevant for the South. "All planes fly to Vancouver". I am suspect of Vancouver. You should be working with the people here.

Mel Kotyk (MK) – We are meeting here now to engage the people here. Vancouver was chosen for logistical reasons as it is easy to fly there (ENGOS, industry, government and others) than to go from community to community in the north. Later on, we will meet back up here in the communities. In regards to breaking up the PNCIMA area, this is something that the group might wish to do as the forum and our meetings with people progress.

The original regional planning encompassed the North Coast, Central Coast and South Coast, as manageable areas. Now it is nebulous.

MK – The boundaries were from the Canadian process and were chosen for practicality. From here we can decide how to work within this area. We could break up by geographic regions, or we could break up by themes, topics or issues. This is our (inclusive) decision to make on what makes sense for this area.

It doesn't make sense to work on the whole West coast. This does not leave me with confidence in this process. Why not change it now? Break up to North coast, Vancouver Island, etc. Do this now, before it is too late.

MK – Together we will design the process, it is up to us. We will find out what worked in other areas and we will bring this together for the West Coast.

Can we change the boundaries?

MK – The PNCIMA boundary is set, though we can break the way we tackle the issue up by theme, area, etc.

This doesn't make sense; it overcomplicates things.

I am concerned about the involvement of local people, especially with the forum in Vancouver. Lots of money (from the Moore foundation) is available in the south for ENGOs. You have offered funding for travel; I didn't think that would happen. How do **we** get involved, to plug into the process? Who is going to give us money? How are we going to compete with ENGOs who will try to shut our livelihoods down? We can't hire planners or biologists.

<Joy asked others if they were given money to do this – both said no>

I am happy that the NCSFNSS is on the steering committee, however, not all of their interests may coincide with local interests. **How do we compete and how do we plug in?** You need to ensure that commercial fishermen's values are incorporated, and not just thorough the general planning process or the First Nations.

Andrew Fulton (AF) - How do you want to be engaged?

We don't need people who don't live up here to run our lives. How do we engage in scientific discussion?

*MK – You raise an important point. Every person interests need to be heard, we need have transparency for the process to succeed. We can't have one interest dominate as we need to have an integrated process. You all need to be heard. We have met with industry and ENGOs and both groups have the same concern as you; how will they get their voices heard? **How do we find the balance?***

The purpose (of PNICMA) is to bring people together. This is essential and we need to do this now. How can we make this work to have people's voice heard? This is critical for successful outcome. If we deviate from this principle, no one will implement the plan, no one will buy in, and this process will fall apart.

Who is financing this? How much? What is the allocation of funding? How well funded is this process?

MK – PNCIMA is my #1 priority in the service level agreement for us and oceans staff in Prince Rupert, Vancouver and Nanaimo. There is never as much money as we would like so we need everyone to participate. Each participant will come with what they have. ENGOs and industry can bring money, and data from environmental assessments and other data collections. First Nations have different access to money and would be able to contribute. DFO has access to money and resources. Together it will come together. Should we have everything run by one leader? This is too big of a task, we need to chunk it out and have everybody contribute to the process.

The Fisheries Act supports marine ecosystem planning. Oceanographically speaking, having this big area makes sense.

Commercial fishermen have only been around here on a very small timeframe but they have removed fish and biodiversity. What about what the system looked like 100 years ago? This is more than what has happened in the near past. Will this process assume steady state? With climate change and PDO this area will change oceanographically. The system is not steady state.

MK – We will never have all the data, but that should not stop us from proceeding with the knowledge we do have and amend as necessary as new information is discovered.

I have been to lots of meetings over the years and all of them fizzled and nothing happened. How do you get local input? How do you divvy up the areas? This is a large area, with lots of processes. How will you deal with larval distribution? Oil spills? You should try a pilot project. Local area management has been tried in different countries. I would like to see PNCIMA to take this approach. We should work with biological processes, not just to a line on a chart

MK – When we look at the issues, we can decide how to divide this up. This will depend on what theme you are looking at.

I have concerns over timelines, and the process suddenly stopping or fizzling away because of money. I am concerned that there is not a lot of northern representation. The south has most of industry and affects, and they could take over the process. We need to know if we have a timeline and resources.

MK – This is a complicated process. A question back to you is ‘How should we do this without having it take a long time?’

How will our management plan (for the Skeena and Nass) match with what you are doing?

MK – What the final plan will look like is up to you. There are many options on what this could look like. One large all encompassing document? It could be a binder that is continually being filled as various themes are concluded and eventually becomes more cohesive? It could look different. It all depends on what is your measure of success.

I have a question on the representative model. I am having a dark flashback to the North Coast LRMP. The stakeholder representation and data were bad and fell apart. How will the forum engage the stakeholders? Who was contacted? How was the invite structured to include commercial fishermen?

MK – We sent out about 450 invitations to groups, and encouraged them to forward to others.

Coral Cargill (CC) – Invitations were sent out to every fishery and every separate area (eg crab area A). They were sent to representatives by species and area.

What is your advisory capacity? What is the process if stakeholders can't agree? What is the dispute resolution?

MK – We haven't designed this yet. This is why it is important that we all come together to have this discussion and develop a process that all the interested parties can live with.

I haven't heard much about this. It seems like a dragged together process. You have pulled us into this process. I hope that the governance structure is not a token gesture. First Nation interests are constitutionalized, and are higher than public interests. Gitgaatla owns 2/3 of this coastline – you have surrounded us. If you want to succeed, any decisions must be addressed by our hereditary chiefs, our band council, and our communities. **You need to come to the communities, and listen to the people.**

We have already gathered traditional knowledge for this area. We value our knowledge and will guard it well.

I don't agree with holding the forum in Vancouver, and the community won't agree. You need to come to the community.

MK - We will do that.

The province is not involved, and is watching from the sidelines – why is the province not involved?

MK – We have invited the provincial government. The province has participated and has sat at the tables and they should sign off when ready. They are encouraged to participate and have done so at a working level, but not at the political level. They will be at the forum. They are coming around. We are

optimistic that they will be fully involved soon, and we are ready when they are able to come.

How do you envision that the plan will be implemented? How will it be enforced? How will it help the average person making a living on the coast?

MK – The question of Implementation and enforcement is an interesting one, and will be accomplished through existing processes and authorities. This process is not trying to undermine or circumvent existing processes and authorities. If regulatory bodies follow this, it will cut down on duplication and reduce regulatory overlap, which will decrease the burden in your day to day lives.

Is your intention to zone the coast into areas by uses?

MK – We are already doing this to some degree through:

- *Establishing Marine protected areas*
- *Instituting Fisheries openings and closing*
- *The work being done at Gwaii Hanaas as examples*

This is already happening and it is the intent that the PNCIMA process will bring sense to this. I am often asked: “what will this look like and where is it going?” – We can’t answer these questions before we go through this process.

What impact will this have on people harvesting in certain areas?

MK – We need to balance ecological sustainability with economic prosperity, and not at the expense of each other. People need economic prosperity.

Will it be fish or oil and gas?

What will it look like in the end? I have a vision of the binder you mentioned earlier sitting and collecting dust. It would be good for you and Ottawa.

Why do I want to participate as a fisherman if province is not going to participate? This is all vague/broad; we want a vision. I need a goal to make steps.

MK – It doesn’t need to be a binder. We will look at look back east at Eastern Scotia Shelf Integrated Management plan and examine what was good, bad, what worked? While at the ESSIM forum I asked a panel, which had

*representation from many areas including First Nations, ENGO's, Industry, Coastal Communities and government what advice could they give? They all answered identically, yet individually: **Take your time.** It takes time to articulate your position and interests, to hear and understand, to come together based on interests, and to bring usual conflicts together to form a solution. Don't rush the process, don't try to force it. People need to sit down and go through it. Collaboration is why people want to be here.*

Just oil?

MK – No.

Jack's concern about arbitrary boundaries; I am having Déjà vu to the CCLRMP. It was supposed to be in the central coast, but then it drifted to the south.

Province said the same thing as you – why is the other guy not playing? Are you being childish? Why didn't DFO start in with land use plan?

MK – We have a different relationship now. We have a signed MOU with the province on ocean management and are working quite collaboratively with them on a number of issues and projects..

What will success look like? You should deal with this early and then people will participate, but we won't if the final product is a binder. We need to see the value in this. We need to be driven by the sense of what this will do for everyone. You shouldn't say you will just use regulations that are in place; this probably will need fundamental change.

MK – The Oceans Act has no regulatory authority and I understand your concerns.

Norman touched on this; we all have a vision of what we want this to look like and what we want it to be. But we have been stuck in advisory processes that go nowhere for 20 years, and nothing seems to happen.

People want consultation and accommodation like our First Nation neighbors. We want the ability to do more than provide advice. You may need to use significant policy changes to reach our vision.

MK – There needs to be a strong rationale to make policy change, but if you have the rationale, then an argument could be made.

I have heard this 1000 times before, but bureaucrats use what they think best for policy.

You don't want to narrow the scope and limit this to existing regulatory schemes as Des and Norm have pointed out.

You compared OCP's and PNCIMA. Is PNCIMA considered a living document? People have process fatigue. Their comments and recommendations fall on deaf ears. Will this change to meet needs of the people? Phrases like "when it's done" set people up as. Things are always in flux. We live here, we change with it, and you need to change with it too. You can't write in change.

MK – I fully agree. How would you balance comments like “how long will it take since it cannot go on forever” with above comment on a “living document”? How can we give people comfort that the process will both be fixed but adaptive to future changes?

You might be surprised. By not having a final document people might put in more if they know this is living document that they are affecting.

The bands are participating, but what impact will it have if treaties are not signed?

I am out of processes because I have lost faith. I used to be very involved. Take the Royal commission Pierce report for example. Where did they go? In this diagram, I'm at the bottom. Where do the recommendations go once people give them? What comes out of this? I am tired from having work on a project, then having them disappear.

I was involved with the integrated groundfish process for 10 years. It was great when started, but now it has turned into a travesty/disaster. The process moved to Vancouver and now the North Coast representation isn't there.

You say you like small communities, but you will sink us anyways. You say you want people there. Everything is wonderful today, but the people in this room we will always be here, it will be our demise, our recommendations are ignored, and this process is going to be the same. There are so many different interests, is this realistic?

MK – If this becomes just a government process or government/First Nation process, it would be really tough. If everyone has input, then we could have success. At the forum we will discuss international marine planning processes. They will inform us how we might want to make things work here, by looking at

what worked and what didn't in their processes. This PNCIMA process needs to include the people who work here.

Going back to my previous comment of how long – I was alluding to the funds. Nisga'a is not in the process until you come to us. I am not a representative. Our fleets have been shrinking for various fisheries so that you can't even recognize the fleets anymore. Climate change will dictate this process. It is happening so fast. Salmon could be gone in places to the south soon.

We will develop a plan and make decisions for whatever is in our territory and we will participate in your decisions that will affect us.

I have a colleague on the east coast who has been involved in the Scotia shelf process. Their comments are falling on deaf ears. They are disappointed in the process, as after 5 years, DFO is not ratifying this due to oil and gas. Is this true? And if we put all this work into PNCIMA, and come together to make recommendations, will the government commit?

MK – ESSIM is a good process with its own challenges. There have been complaints of no tangible outcomes, so it is difficult to determine the next steps. The Minister has not signed off on this plan, however, the plan is still being implemented by those at the table with regulatory authority.

The LRMP was based on ecosystem based management, but the loggers just wanted to keep their jobs. I say keep the salmon. If you want an OCP, this will destroy everything except the jellyfish. You need to look at the systems in PNCIMA. The seabird colonies would be good indicators for this process.

MK – Good point and something that could be considered.

For an OCP, the city owns and ratifies the OCP. It can't be changed airy-fairy. More public hearings are needed to change the OCP. I am confused. If this advisory body comes to a consensus, will the government implement this? This has not been the case in the past. Any plan is unlikely to be implemented if controversial. If you have the regulatory authorities at the table and have consensus, will this be implemented? All agencies at the table (Parks, transportation, etc) will need to be a part of this process. If we were simply advisors to these agencies, I am skeptical that this will happen and go through.

I am happy that the NCSFNSS is at the table with government, but we haven't heard anything about funding. The ENGOs are shutting down fishing. How do you combine social, economic and ecological interests for such a large area?

If we all drop off (because of funding, the process taking too long, the meetings being held in Vancouver, etc.) then we will be told that we had our chance to be there. The remainder will be cherry picked and implemented. This fear is based on every advisory process that has happened on the coast. People who live here aren't making the decisions on things that will affect us here. We will get out maneuvered and out financed by others.

MK – I am optimistic that this process will not go that way. A question for you all: What do we need to do, or what kind of structure do we need to have the opposite happen?

The area is too big. We need to meet here for access. We are worried about the people who have access to big dollars and whose job it is to change things.

MK – The decisions will not be made by those with the most money. Industry and people with access to large sums of money will be there, but they will not have any extra influence. This process will be done collectively.

We don't have the necessary information. We need information to make decisions. Other groups have this information. For the Skeena River Watershed Committee, you needed to have a scientist to participate. Industry doesn't have the money to do this. Bocaccio – there is not enough science to answer this question.

MK – We all need access to information and the ability to understand and analyze it in order to be able to have a common understanding of the issues and options to resolve those issues. This need equals a representative at the table.

I think you need stakeholder representation of the user groups at the same table as the agencies where one hundred percent consensus should be reached. I think the table should ask for peer reviewed information and predictive modeling to make informed decisions.

We do not have the money to do this as you previously suggested. All the money for the community is already allocated. Same with commercial fishermen. We need objective science and we need financial support for participation. Participation needs to be protected and assured.

Meaningful consultation for the Gitxaala means that aboriginal rights and title must be observed.

The Gitxaala territory was not included in the turning point brochure – This is offensive.

MK – To clarify my previous statement, First Nations have access to funds that federal agencies do not have access to.

You can't have the level of participation based on the money available to a party

To follow what was previously said, you need to fund sectors so representation works. Trollers have diverse interests and positions. For all of their interests to be heard, they need long facilitated conversations with the representative that goes to the table. Each sector is diverse so there will be lots of people who aren't represented by one person. This is complicated and expensive, but necessary. Funding should be made available for smaller meetings before the main ones. The LRMP process was troubled because of this. My process design suggestion is funding for proper representation.

The process needs to be broken up geographically. The overreaching boundary should exist, but this is political. Planning needs to occur locally without large expense. There are questions that are unanswered about resources that we need to make decisions on. There is not a lot of funding available and we need help to answer these questions.

For 25 years I have participated in these processes. We've had meetings where 100% consensus has been reached. Our advice was given to government, who wrote a plan that did not include any of our advice and all they sent us was a thank-you. It is always other people making the decision for my life and this have left me in worse shape. Young things are always telling fishermen that we don't know about fish, that we don't know what going on. Well I've been regulated right out of business. The process has taken everyone away from the coast. **The government works for me.** You need to prove to us that you are credible. We need to believe you, and right now we don't believe you.

Commitment and transparency are just buzzwords. Other people are participating at another level that circumvent our decisions. We can't have this end-run; we are the table.

We have a marine plan which has gathered information and we have formulated opinions. It was good that our planning process was mentioned here. We are the forefront of marine planning. All communities have done some work which can be input into the plan. You need to do this; local input is important for buy-in. If the locals do not support you, the plan will do nothing but gather dust.

Government needs a communication strategy. How will people have access to the process and provide input on viewpoints on specific issues? Meetings? Website? You need to work on a communications strategy.

AF – How would you like this to be done?

MK – There are lots of good comments here. We hope that people can come to the forum. Your participation is important to determine how you will participate in a fair and meaningful way. We need to set this process up so it will result in real change; no end-runs, and no documents that sit on the shelf collecting dust.

There are lots of good experiences in this room, and some of our experiences are examples of what not to do. We need to hear this. We need to try something for this process that will work here in the north. We don't want to design, run and implement this process unilaterally; it needs to be done collectively. The government MOU's are the starting point.

On the east coast, they have a cod based system. On the west coast, it is a salmon based system. We don't want to be left with jellyfish. We live in an Internet age – we need fast Internet connections for people to communicate for meetings.

MK – We could set the forum up so it is interactive with feedback coming in, not so it is just broadcasting information out.

DFO needs to rebuild broken trust. Communication needs to come from both directions. You need to **listen** to us. Relationships need to be built between and within sectors. Willingness and commitment should be core values. We are all utterly committed to here, the coast, and DFO needs to reflect this. They need to be open to doing whatever is necessary to do this. This process may not look like every other process.

If you want trust and cooperation, you need to have an office here. We need people to be involved all the way through. We have limited access to you in Vancouver. Come up here, understand our issues, build the relationship and trust.

MK – Three DFO Oceans are here, working and living in the community.

I would like to go back to Caroline's point. We have lost our voice in DFO processes (fleet rationalization). Provide funding and a framework to give each sector back its voice.

Our voices must be heard all the way through the process.

Steve Diggon (SD) – *Web conferencing is available for the forum.*

MK – Are there any questions on the forum? No.

Follow up at PNCIM.org with questions and comments. There are tight deadlines for the funding – go to the website.

Will the steering committee panel change?

MK – The steering committee panel is comprised of coastal First Nations (Skeena and Haida with Turning Point) along with government representatives (parks/natural resources/environment/DFO). This was laid out in the MOU and this is how it exists right now.

Our next steps are compiling and sharing what we've heard.

For the MOU, the province can sign on. What if others wanted to sign on?

10 years ago in Hecate Strait, information was gathered on what it used to look like.

Where do stakeholders and communities fit into the process? With First Nations and the federal government?

MK – We need to figure this out (together). The Canadian constitution outlines the relationship with First Nations, and the courts have ruled that the government has a different relationship with First Nations than with other stakeholders. How stakeholder input will come in is something we need to work on.

A caution for you: Where does Nisga'a fit in? We are not part of Turning Point or NCSFNSS. This agreement is not with all First Nations.

How much power do we have? If all stakeholders agree, can we make the decisions and have the power?

Here is an example of coordination not happening: The harvest planning committee (salmon) is meeting on the 26th. ENGOs can be at both, but we do not have the money to do this. We have to make the choice, and when it comes down to it we will go to the bread and butter meeting.

MK – There are too many competing processes. We need to plan for this through informing decision making. Time is short and we need time for discussion.

You have to look at demographics. We will have a small voice at the forum compared to many others. The province has not been there for many processes. This is common. Why are they not there? As British Columbians, where do we fit in?

Is the forum list open, so we can see who will be there, and figure out who else needs to go?

MK – I can't tell you who, but I can tell you the groups and sectors, but I don't know that yet. The invitations went out to everyone we could think of. Register by March 15th and apply for financial assistance by March 9th through the travel link.

<Forms have been provided at fisherman's hall>

MK – Commitment is important. If you have additional concerns or want to provide input to your elected officials, please do not underestimate the power of letters to Ministers or your representatives: "this is important to us, stand behind it". These have real strength.

I hope your bosses are open to being adaptable like you.

PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Kitimat

March 4th, 2009, 12:45 - 3:30 pm

Kitimat Valley Institute

Meeting notes by Anna Gerrard

Participants

Dennis Horewood	Kitimat Valley WLF, Kitimat resident
Diane Sewlett	Sustainable Development District of Kitimat, Kitimat resident
Ernst Poschenmeden	Haisla Business Development Group, Kitamaat resident
Gary Alexcee	Kitsumkalum, Kitsumkalum resident
Joanne Monaghan	Mayor of Kitimat, Kitimat resident
Joe Maag	Kitimat resident
June Macaulay	Concerned citizen, Kitimat resident
K L Henderson	Metaanex Corp, Kitimat resident
M Stenson	Kitimat resident
Richard McLauen	Kitimat Council, Kitimat resident
Siyana Clement	Methanex Inc, Kitimat resident
Terry Bennett	Kitsumkalum, Terrace resident
Whitney Lukuku	Kitamaat Village Council, Kitamaat Village resident

Hosts & Presenters

Andrew Fulton (AF)	Facilitator
Anna Gerrard	Note Taking
Bruce Watkinson (BW)	North Coast-Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society
Coral Cargill (CC)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Prince Rupert Oceans office
Mel Kotyk (MK)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Vancouver Oceans office
Steve Dignon (SD)	Coastal First Nations

MEETING NOTES

Welcome and Presentation

Welcome and introductions by Bruce Watkinson

Bruce Watkinson (BW) – We are here to share thoughts and learn about PNCIMA. The minutes will be distributed.

Andrew Fulton (AF) – Logistics and Forum logistics

Today's session will lead into, and inform the forum. There are 3 questions on each table – feel free to send them in later (by fax/e-mail). These questions are the starting point for our discussions at the forum. This meeting is to make a connection with this region.

Mel Kotyk (MK) – the slides will provide an overview of what we are trying to accomplish. This all started with the *Oceans Act* which dictates that we develop an integrated management plan, using consensus to guide decision makers.

How do we do this, what does this mean? The *Ocean Act* outlines the precautionary approach, consensus and integrated management.

The area makes sense from an ecological standpoint. From a political or social standpoint, it can be confusing.

There are many government and regulatory authorities within this area. The management of this area is complex, and fragmented and has communication barriers. This can be difficult to manage and can be overwhelming. It will be challenging to create a coherent, coordinated plan. The *Oceans Act* dictates that DFO will coordinate this process.

The constitution and the courts outline an obligation for governments to deal with First Nations differently. To address this, an MOU has been signed and you can find this on the web. The MOU establishes a way of working and talking together and it will guide DFO through this process.

We are now starting with stakeholders.

Activities happen in isolation of each other. An integrated management plan will bring these issues together for a coordinated approach. Interested parties will work together to define interests, conflicts and solutions.

These plans are not meant to circumvent or take authority away from regulatory bodies. We will use general consensus to guide decisions.

The plan needs to be a living document to be adaptive.

We need to recognize the work that is already happening. This work is ongoing (data collection, courts, regulations). This information/data will benefit the plan and the plan will help decision makers with some of their decisions.

The forum will help determine how we do this. To function well, we need the involvement of everyone. The 26th and 27th is the kick off for this process. It will be used to inform people about the issues, to discuss what is “ocean planning” and how to do this. What success is and what to look out for. What are the interests, pressures and sensitivities in this region? We will have experts in from other areas to share what has worked, what didn't and any advice can they give us. Using this, we can pick out bits from other plans to devise a plan that will work for us. The forum will also be used to provide information, to discuss what is out there, determine next steps, and to hear your issues, challenges, objectives and vision.

Richmond was chosen for the location of the forum due to logistics. Financial support will be provided for travel and the forum will also be webcast.

Today we will provide an overview. We will hear your issues, concerns and get your feedback and points of view. What does a collaborative approach look like to you? What are the next steps? All of this needs to work and fit in with the people here.

Group Discussion and Questions

What is on the table? This is a fine time to discuss the fisheries model. Will you be open to discussing different models? The current salmon model is a failure.

At first European contact, the rivers were full. We are not interested in divvying up areas. The First Nations have looked after the salmon. We knew who owns the salmon and who didn't. In this new model, everyone owns the salmon, we forget about our neighbours. This common property resource model is not working. We need suggestions to improve and change this – we could use the model that used to exist and was used by First Nations. Pinks and chum are not doing well anymore. The Haisla has been fishing for thousands of years and now there are no longer any eulachon. We have an agreement with Eurocan to fix the fish taint, but now we have difficulty getting enough fish to sample, where there used to be thousands. This model is an abject failure. Can this group look at alternative models and not divvy up this shrinking pot?

Mel Kotyk (MK) – It will be interesting to see what issues the group chooses to tackle. There are many issues that can be addressed such as sustainable fisheries marine transportation and many others? What goes into the plan, what the recommendations are, how the plan will develop.

Kitimat is the second biggest port. Maritime traffic is our lifeblood. How will PNCIMA fit in with our rights under the [Navigable Waters Act](#) which states that we can use the waters freely?

MK – That is an important point. PNCIMA will not supersede existing regulatory authorities. This process will be used to inform the decision makers within these regulatory bodies.

I worked on the LRMP for recommendations, etc. That plan lacks enforcement. I would like to see enforcement related to recommendations or obligations. The final document needs teeth. The LRMP dictates what cannot be done, but who ensures that this happens? This needs to be enshrined in the process.

MK – This is a common sentiment. After all the work that goes into something like this, you need to be confident that the recommendations / options will be adopted. The advantage of a collaborative process is that people will be willing to implement the recommendations. There is no need for hard enforcement since the options will have already been agreed to.

We need to establish a common ground. This process needs to begin with an agreement with everyone on common ground.

MK – I agree.

What is the timeline for this? 12 months? 5 years? While you are planning, things could be put in place that would gum up the plan. There is a sense of urgency here.

MK – It comes down to the design of the process which we (together) will create. ESSIM took many years to come together. They had to break down barriers to collaborate on a consensus plan. The more time you spend, the better the document will be at the end. However the downside to this is that projects and planning process still must go on in the meantime. This is a very complex issue and will likely take time to complete. This will depend on the speed at which people come together for buy in.

The KLRMP never ended. You need deadlines or goals to work towards, to focus on, which will cut down on meandering.

MK – The advantage to having a set timelines and objectives is that no one can stall.

The KLRMP took 10 years. If something is done too quickly there is a downside. When things get fast tracked it leads to lower participation.

MK – We need to find a balance between the two. We need to ensure buy-in. We can learn from examples in the past so let's design something that works for this area. This is a large area with differences between the communities, and this creates some difficulty. We can break down the areas that feed into the larger area. We have that flexibility. This division could be based on topic, geography or both.

Andrew Fulton (AF)– What mechanism would work for you to ensure involvement and participation? How would you like to be included?

I would like to be consulted. We are dependant on marine traffic and we need to be involved.

AF – What does consultation mean to you?

Being included in every step of the way.

Understanding common ground, and providing information on every aspect of ocean use.

Advertising when and how you are going to be doing this. I only heard about this through word of mouth. Hold meetings at times that are better for the greater population (weekends and evenings)

AF – So you're saying that the process needs to be opened up to anyone who has an interest?

Open to anyone who has a vote. This meeting was not well advertised and it is at a bad time.

AF – So you would like to see a communications strategy?

Yes.

AF – What does it mean to be involved? What mechanisms would be useful?

Make people aware of what PNCIMA is, what the affects may be if this happened, and what this would mean to the community.

You need to figure out how to provide information to participants. Some people will go to places where information exists and assess the available information. Priorities and activities for that issue should be provided. For example, Kitimat has just finished its OCP, which is full of rich information.

AF – Share information and provide impacts to the communities?

Create an online resource library where you can read, understand and get up to speed on impacts.

AF – Engagement.

People live up here and use the resources here. The ENGOs do not live up here. It is respectful to include and honor the people who live on the coast.

It is respectful, and having people come to our communities and see the coast helps them understand. Other people who do not live here make the decisions for the people who do live here.

You shouldn't just go to Prince Rupert, you should be going to Bella Bella, Kitimat village, etc. Showing up in these different places shows respect.

AF – People need to see themselves as an important part of the process.

What are your values, guiding principles, foundations? How would you define success? Include communities at a community level. Make people feel important. Let their voices be heard. Have a coast-centered process.

Ensure that you include the people that live on the river (Kitselas/ Kitsumkalum). They make their livings on the river.

AF – Include connections to the coast.

Communication is a big thing to have for the group and for PNCIMA. How do you engage your regulatory authorities? Bring them to these areas. I agree in principle in coming out to the communities. The decision makers in Ottawa, they do not hear our concerns. They need to come to our communities.

AF – You would like to get the regulatory authorities here first hand.

This needs to come from the ground, where people are residing.

AF – We need to find ways to do this.

You need to include the values of people here.

Build connections to the coast. People with boats here are not from here. They just use the resources.

Some coastal planning processes are based on an ecosystem planning model. This is still used but now it is accepted that people are a part of the ecosystem. You need to include people and their activities. The ecoindustrial planning and management bridges with the ecosystem model well.

Interest based negotiations compartmentalize the process into components; sports fishermen, commercial fishermen, etc. You should be able to speak to your interests, but not be slotted permanently into that position. This gives focus to negotiation.

AF – Allow people to adapt, learn and voice their interests.

Some of us are in positions that represent many groups. Kitimat is both an industrial and tourism area. We can speak from different aspects with legitimate information. Some participants may represent various interests. All communities need to be involved.

We have problems with fish poaching. Foreign ships come in at night and leave nothing on the bottom. We report them, but nothing ever happens.

Bruce Watkinson (BW) – *You need a referee, monitoring and enforcement.*

AF – How to fit in ecosystem values.

Trade is important to inland communities (transport, mining, etc) and these values need to be related back to the coast. The trade is ongoing, it is not going to stop. The ability to share and gather information is important. People need to be aware of the rigor that goes into shipping evaluations (navigation risk assessments, documentation, the approval process).

This is a learning process. There are lots myths around industry. The environmental and economic impacts are better than people think. Prejudices need to be informed. This needs to be an education process.

AF – What do you see as the key issues, opportunities and concerns?

Movement of dangerous cargoes.

You need to define that.

Tankers or...?

BC ferries has a description. No people are allowed on those sailings.
Pipeline/oil transport is different from aluminum ingot.

You need to look at everything. Aluminum ingot is still large cargo and there are still lots of accidents. Look at every aspect of movement, what is at risk?

There are lots of tankers everywhere, but no one looks at them. For example, there are more in Georgia Strait.

Trade occurs. You need to understand how this connects to shipping, etc.
Information needs to flow.

How will this work with the provincial parks and conservancies (and heritage areas, BC parks, MPAs etc)? The parks system is extensive on the coast. You need to marry the ocean to the land as they are attached.

MK – We are encouraging the province to participate fully. We have a Canada – BC MOU for working on oceans issues, and we are working together at the staff level. With the MOU with First Nations the province helped craft it and hopefully they will sign when they are ready. We are encouraging them to fully participate and they are coming around.

BW – The province is keeping an eye on things. They are hesitant to get involved in a 10 year process.

That was a good point about connecting the land and water.

Access to food fish is important, eulachon in particular. Poaching is a problem.

BW – There are by-catch issues. If you know that the fish are migrating, temporarily shut down other fisheries.

Fisheries management on the coast and how it fits together.

Ecotourism locations and regulations. Traditional use and First Nation areas.

Fish farming.

AF – Local or ?

In principle, looking at the whole coast and how it is managed. Oil and gas development for example. Are we going to see it? Where is it going? It is a big problem for me. We need control over development instead of chasing it.

Energy corridors or all kinds (run of river, pipelines, transmission lines etc.) The run of river facilities are mainly located on the coast.

Look into the benefits of these industries. How does the money come back to the communities for sustainability? We need to be ahead of the game (oil and gas for example). Benefits should come back to us, and these should be written into the plan.

Share BC is an example for NE oil and gas. A proportion of the profits are given back to the communities.

If the country gets royalties off shipping, it needs to find a way back to the communities.

Welcome to the world of First Nations.

Tidal power and wind farms.

It's all an energy corridor. How does this affect the ocean?

This process needs to be adaptable to the future.

Revenue streams (Shetland Island Trust). They took the risk for the activity so they get the benefit. Norway, Prince William Sound and Cook Inlet are other examples.

We can be afraid and not let this happen, or we can prepare for these (discuss monitoring/first response, etc). Make sure the information is available to tie this into the larger picture.

AF – What about the changes for this process?

We need to get on common ground or we will go nowhere fast. We need to see what is working around the world.

BW – We need access to information and transparency to share the information.

We need an online repository for this information.

A big challenge will be developing relationships

Sharing information is good. Any research undertaken should not have a mandate to find a certain answer. This happens and it is a problem.

Keep an open mind.

AF – Please fax or e-mail us if you think of more information.

The forum will be used to learn about what people have done before us. The breakout sessions will bring together what we have been hearing about the different issues. The break out groups will also be used to establish common ground. The forum will also be used to craft a vision for PNCIMA.

Are regulatory authorities from Ottawa going to be there?

MK – Representatives for various authorities will be there.

The communities you've visited, have you reviewed their existing plans?

AF – Would you like to know how these plans will be incorporated? (yes)

MK – We will look at what is out there, and we will factor this into the process as we shape it. Elements will certainly come into play, but we are not at that stage yet.

The Kitsumkalum, for example, have traditional sites on the coast that they have used for years. These need protective measures from people on ships and tourism boats. At Hartley Bay, artifacts were stolen. How can PNCIMA find protection for things like these? Beachcombers and Alaska fishermen come and take down our areas. There are DFO beacons that can record when larger boats enter restricted areas. These might be useful.

AF – A goal of PNCIMA is to integrate these different things: How to monitor areas.

These beacons can track anything over 70 ft. How can you strengthen shipping reporting?

Maybe this is a good time to talk about a First Nation Coast Guard again. It was shot down before.

BW – Who better to monitor these areas?

It would be a big achievement to get this plan done. It would be an even bigger achievement to get the money in place. Where is Canada and BC coming from with this? At the end of the day, we will need money to implement this.

We could tie this into the communities benefitting from industry, but this must be up front.

This may require additional government services (monitoring, etc). We can likely look elsewhere in the world for a cost estimate.

Feel free to send around the invitations and invite others to the forum.

There is no cost for the forum and funding will be provided for travel and accommodation.

PNCIMA Forum Preparatory Meeting – Port Hardy

March 5th, 2009, 6:15 – 9:00 pm

Malone's Oceanside Bistro

Meeting notes by Anna Gerrard

Participants

Al Huddleston	Regional District of Mount Waddington
Alex Chartrand	Central coast gov. arm rep, Wuikinuxv resident
Andrew Taylor	Pacificus Biological Services, Port Hardy resident
Bev Parnham	District of Port Hardy, Port Hardy resident
Bob Wooden	Commercial Fisher, Port Hardy resident
Cindy Hanuse	Wuikinuxv, Port Hardy resident
Cody Wicks	Archipelago, Port Hardy resident
Dallas Smith	Nanwakolas Council, Campbell River resident
Curtis Wilson	Nanwakolas Council, Campbell River resident
Dawn Nicolson	TFN/KHFN, Coal Harbour resident
Duncan Taggart	BCTS, Port McNeill resident
Earl Newman	Heiltsuk, Bella Bella resident
Glen Miller	Citizen, Port McNeill resident
Heather Aldersey	Living Oceans Society, Sointula resident
Heidi Soltau	Mt. Waddington Regional District, Sointula resident
Jackie Hildering	Earthling Enterprises, Port McNeill resident
Jim McIsaac	Tbuck Suzuke, Sidney resident
John Driscoll	Living Oceans Society, Sointula resident
John Salo	Morgan Bay Logging, Sointula resident
Kim Olsen	Commercial fishermean, Shawnigan Lake resident
Lara Renehan	Living Oceans Society, Sointula resident
Linda Phillipp	Concerned citizen, Port McNeill resident
Mac Willing	Concerned Citizen, Port Hardy resident
Midori Nicolson	TFN/KHFN, Coal Harbour resident
Norm Prince	RDMW, Coal Harbour resident
Phil Wainwright	RDMW, Winter Harbour resident
Scott Harris	Nanwakolas Council, Port Hardy resident
Shane Thomas	Sointula resident
Stan McLennan	Port Hardy Council, Port Hardy resident
Tim Chester	Ministry of Forests, Port McNeill resident
Tom Russell	PHMA, Port Hardy resident
Vern Sampson	Living Oceans Society, Sointula resident
Will Soltau	Living Oceans Society, Sointula resident

Hosts & Presenters

Andrew Fulton (AF)	Facilitator
Anna Gerrard	Note Taking
Kelly Francis (KF)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Vancouver Oceans office
Steve Diggon (SD)	Coastal First Nations

MEETING NOTES

Welcome and Presentation

Welcome by Dallas Smith

Dallas Smith – The Nanwakolas Council is working together with DFO on PNCIMA.

Andrew Fulton (AF) – Introduced himself as facilitator

- Described details on the PNCIMA forum
 - Date
 - Place
 - Website
 - Registration
 - Travel

The purpose of the forum is to provide information, introduce who is involved, discuss the values and issues of the people here. The forum is the start of our stakeholder engagement.

The goals of today's meeting are to address how you would like to be engaged, to understand some of your values, interests and issues, and also to take any questions you may have. We would also like feedback on the forum.

Kelly Francis (KF) – <Information given during the presentation that was not in the slideshow>

- PNCIMA is one of 5 priority LOMA's identified for development of integrated management approaches
- These are only a sample of the conflicting uses and environmental issues
- The governance for this area is complex and confusing
- The objective of the Oceans Act is the coordination of these governing bodies

- The MOU outlines the government-to-government governance structure that will oversee and coordinate planning in PNCIMA. For the federal government this includes Parks Canada, Environment Canada, Natural Resources Canada, and DFO The province currently has an observer status
- The reason we are here (and the reason for the forum) is stakeholder engagement. We want your input before we create the engagement model
- Plans will be done at different scales (LOMA/CMA)
- We are currently at the assessment stage
- A number of initiatives are already underway

The forum will be used to discuss issues, challenges, opportunities and values, to create a vision and objectives, and to discuss a mechanism for stakeholder engagement.

Group Discussion and Questions

Are there local/regional representatives for the steering committee?

I didn't realize any exploratory wells existed.

Kelly Francis (KF) – There is currently a moratorium for oil and gas in this area but there are some existing tenures.

Will tidal waters, bays, rivers, etc be included in the PNCIMA plan? What is the legal scope of PNCIMA?

Steve Diggon (SD) – This will be a collaborative approach. It does not impose on existing plans, it works with them.

Will this be a component of a land use plan?

SD – No, it will feed into them.

How will this be integrated into provincial plans? How will this massive planning area incorporate provincial and regional planning?

KF – DFO and their LOMA planning is complementary to the province's coastal planning. We need planning at different scales.

SD – The intention was for the LOMA to encompass the whole area and the CMAs to feed into and inform the PNCIMA planning. It is intended to be a living document.

How will all of the stakeholders have input? It takes a long time with lots of people for planning. What will be incorporated?

SD – The process for engagement hasn't been put forward.

You mentioned an area of interest proposal in the slide show. How big and where is this located?

KF – We are currently seeking input. This area is one of 9 new MPAs to be established by 2012 to sustain the health of the oceans. The areas I referred to are the Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound glass sponge reefs. These are areas of interest for potential MPA designation.

What science will you use? Past? Present? Government? Private? This is a big area to cover, it is not just a one day project and the area is changing. The science used in the past has done nothing for us.

KF – The scientific requirements depend on what issue you are looking at. We have research and science in DFO, but we recognize that outside people have science expertise too. We will also bring in experts during this process.

We have to take care of the mountains to take care of the oceans.

Will this process be regulatory (fish limits) or will it instead refer to physical areas or species?

KF – This process does not circumvent existing authorities or licensing allocation. Information from this process will inform the regulatory processes.

For the rockfish conservation areas, the public was asked if they were in the right place, etc. Will this be the same sort of process?

KF – Within PNCIMA process, areas may be identified that will need to be protected. This could be done here through a working group looking at areas with high conservation values or ecologically significant areas.

Looking at the scope of this project, has this been done before? Or is it a whole new thing? We need technical knowledge. These processes usually head south. How does DFO plan on doing research out of Victoria?

KF – Prince Rupert has DFO staff, and this project is also being undertaken in collaboration with First Nations. AAROM has technical teams on the ground.

Where are they based out of?

KF – Prince Rupert, Haida Gwaii and the Central Coast. We have lots of work to do and few people to do it.

How can you take on a project of this magnitude?

Why not go to Klemtu, Oweekeno, etc?

SD – There are not any meetings scheduled for those communities because those nations are represented through Turning Point.

What is Turning Point?

SD – Technical support for all of these bands for ocean planning in each area.

You stated that demand exceeds capacity. Says who? Who made that statement?

KF – To clarify, that slide was to provide a indication of some of the conflicting and competing uses.

What is the commitment of the department? What resources are available? Will the Minister be there for support at the forum?

KF – Phase 1 of the Oceans Action Planning had funding, but we have a new government now and we could use more money.

Where is the province of BC?

KF – They are currently acting as observers. They are working with us on the ground, though they have not formally signed onto the MOU, likely because of the upcoming provincial election..

We need believability/credibility. We want our time and expertise to be heard. DFO is not recognizing critical habitat for species. How can we work within this current climate? You are not believable. We need goodwill. There are not enough people, money or recognition for current problems with species.

KF – This is the first time that we have addressed a problem of this magnitude. We need to start with baby steps to build relationships to work together.

You say that this is a new and important issue, so why haven't we heard more about this? It is a fluke that I found this. No one in the Central Coast even knows about it.

KF – Are you saying, if you want this to be successful and for us to be involved, you need better communication?

This is a huge area and we need more people involved. Why does Bella Coola not know about this? Is funding available to get to Vancouver?

KF – Yes, you can find this information on the website. We will get DFO to spread the word in Bella Coola.

Andrew Fulton (AF) – The invites are open, please feel free to spread them around yourself.

Will there be attempts made to identify SARA critical habitat? SARA requires critical habitat mapping for red listed species, and later blue. Is this part of the process?

3-4 years ago we had a presentation when David Anderson was in power. It looks like that area that they were putting forward as a reserve. This was a quick process. Is this planning process part of this?

KF – Parks will identify National Marine Conservation Areas within the Central Coast to compliment the current NMCA proposals in Haida Gwaii and the Strait of Georgia. PNCIMA will inform this process and visa versa.

I work with Archipelago, but am not here on their behalf. Will the background information be transparent and available to the public?

KF – The information will be available electronically and in hard copy via the WAVES database.

How important are degrees in documenting science? This has screwed us before.

This feels like an afterthought. How big were the other plans? How are you going to make this happen given the resources available? We have a huge amount to gain/lose through this. I found about this meeting through the back door, and I feel like it is being shoved down my throat, and it is not being done in collaboration, that it is not credible.

KF – This is the objective of the forum, to get everyone on the same level to collectively talk about the vision, goals, objectives and how to collaborate.

AF – We will develop this plan together. People need to start together on the same page; how would you like this to look, and how would you like to be engaged?

We need to be on the ground running. I'm not convinced of the financial and political commitment for this process.

Is the intent of this process to split up the pie into more and more areas (eg recreation only or transportation only areas)? Further and further we divide the pie. How many different areas will we have?

KF – With respect to Gwaii Haanas, the NMCA Act specifies that NMCAs must contain at least one fully protected zone. The Oceans Act does not have the same requirement for LOMAs.

As a stakeholder, I am concerned that everyone wants to mark out their area. What does this mean? I am concerned about transit through the area, and about the MPAs/RCAs/bird sanctuaries. Are you going to stovepipe everything, or are you going to oversee the stove piping?

KF – Integrated management means that you consider all activities underway in PNCIMA, consider how everything links together, which is the opposite of cutting up the pie and stove piping.

What is the time frame for the process?

KF – This is not meant to be a 10 year LRMP. The goal is 3-5 years.

I would like to shift the conversation back to finances. Do you have a constitution yet?

Everyone – They are the constitution

I would like to offer some insight from First Nations. The Central Coast LRMP process was supposed to last 2 years, and it has now been 10 years. I am here at the start of this process to add my two bits. It is about time that DFO started this process.

I have been to courts many times, but even if you win, it does not mean that you will get anywhere. We have rights and title here, and we will go to court if necessary, but we do not want to do this. We need to have the government-to-government relationship and the stakeholders to work together with the people on the coast to plan for the best use of the ocean, considering harvesting, climate change, etc. We need to make this harmonized. It's ok to have your doubts and fears, that's what these meetings are for. I hope that DFO listens. We will have the money if we cooperate together, as this gives us political will, though this requires buy-in from everyone.

We need dialogue to get everything out in the open. We all have a vested interest, including sports and commercial fishermen. We all love the ocean and value and treasure it and together we can go a long way. Locking horns will not get us anywhere.

In Richmond, who are the regional and municipal governments that will participate?

SD – The Union of British Columbia Municipalities and the coastal communities have been approached.

Is that an invitation for someone to respond? We want to make sure that we are all on the same program and are looking forward to looking after this varied resource. This is my offer to get involved as a representative for local government.

The need is there, however, March 26th you may not have everyone there. This is a very raw preliminary and it is premature.

I am happy to hear that funds are available for this upcoming meeting. How are you going to engage stakeholders in the future? Funding? Holding the meetings here? In ESSIM, the commercial fishermen are less involved; they do not have any support. We need sustainability for the stakeholders.

KF – We are hoping to get your feedback at the forum and start a strategy for participation. This is not just us developing this process, we will do this collaboratively. The meetings will not always be in Vancouver, the intent is to have meetings throughout the PNCIMA region in the future.

AF – At the forum we will also be talking about what can be learned from other processes.

It is good to hear that funding is available. I realize that this is to be a bottom up process, but I would like to see DFO take the lead. I have a huge distrust of DFO. They need to raise their profile. If DFO is sincere, it will raise their profile. DFO has a lot of homework to do and they have gotten off to a shaky start.

AF – Does this have to do with communication?

Communication and DFO presence.

We need sustainability for the process. Get web-casting involved from the start.

SD – The forum will be web-cast/web-conferenced and you will be able to provide questions and feedback.

When you are planning for sustainability in BC, most stakeholders do not know about fish. How do you prevent financial stakeholders from overpowering other interests? Most people do not know what is going on here. What are your plans to get community leaders involved?

AF – Are you speaking to an education component?

Yes. DFO does not ask for our feedback, certainly not at the ground level anyway. At the head office, maybe.

Can people submit information to the website?

SD – You can post your issues and concerns to the website.

You have obviously done lots of work to date. How did you get here? Who has done the planning to date?

KF – We are still in the pre-planning stage, working on the marine use and quality analysis, and the collaborative governance model between government and First Nations. A lot of work has gone into this. The documents you have provide an overview of the work that has been done, but we still haven't scoped out the other half of the model, the stakeholder collaboration piece. For this, we are at the starting point.

What kind of input have you heard from the other meetings? How did they feel? Did those groups have diverse backgrounds?

SD – The other meetings were similar to here, and the people there had similar concerns. DFO as a leader has a challenge ahead of them because of their past. Getting the different groups engaged is the first step.

I have concerns about Richmond. We have an airport, a ferry, and a highway. Port Hardy would like to see you here.

Can you speak to the working groups? Are they already established or are you still planning to establish them? How will these fit into PNCIMA?

KF – No working groups have been established. We will initially focus on marine shipping to get everyone comfortable with the process. We will establish working groups and decide on how these will feed into the process. Working groups are one possible mechanism to feed into the process and they have not been predetermined.

There will be separate working groups for separate issues; how will you integrate these?

KF – That is up to the secretariat.

What about chronological issues – will these preempt priorities?

KF – We will need to be cognizant of this during the process.

We need to plan in pieces. First we need to get everyone in the room and see who is interested in what. First Nations understand that you need to be holistic. You need to take small bites, break off into groups to work through it and then harmonize. Communication is very important. As we know from the past, DFO does not play well with others. They have the best intentions but are unsure on how to carry these through.

We need the terms of reference to be clear. What is the end product? How do we get there? We need to see something written.

There is lots of information that can be found in the handouts. The word transparency was used earlier. Look through the documents; they will help give some explanations to your questions.

I would like to echo Dallas. Parks Canada has a reputation. I have concerns about DFO, they have no reputation, nothing to worry about. You need to do some soul searching and identify principles that will take us into the future. We need the coastal communities and ecology to survive. We need to sit down and create a long-term vision together.

When a key goal is inclusiveness, I would avoid terms like “key stakeholders”, this may exclude some people.

We need commitment. How will you respond back to us? We need a communication mechanism. Where is the accountability? Fiscal responsibility?

AF – We will create ideas for the vision at the forum.

We will create the vision at the forum? Will this be put out to the communities? Do not stop at the forum.

You need to publicize this better. Make sure all communities know about this. You could create a calendar for future events. You need to communicate well with everyone. You need to share information back and forth on your website. The forum will meet with 400 people out of ...? That number is not good enough.

To illustrate the non-inclusiveness: the mayor of Port Hardy was not invited. On March 26th you will not have a representative sample. You need small community representation. Get the regional districts to distribute the information.

Who picked the key stakeholders?

KF – We sent out the stakeholder invites on the advice of locals in the communities. The message from you is very clear; we were not as thorough as we could have been. We are learning everyday.

PNCIMA started in 2002? We are 5 years into the process, why are we suddenly now being brought into the process. What was the catalyst?

KF – 2002 was not that long ago. It has taken time to pull together scientific information. It has also been challenging for the province, First Nations and the federal Government to develop a governance model.

Was there political pressure?

Different fisheries groups have been invited. It has taken us a while to get ourselves together. It has been a year and a half to organize so some of the delay is our responsibility as we didn't have our ducks in a row. Now we have relationships internally and are ready to work with DFO, and we have the commitment to work with you.

Communication is key. Suddenly **boom** here you are, saying 'let's go' when we have heard nothing on this for 5 years.

AF – You need education and advertising to invite participation.

Who is on the steering committee?

KF – It is outlined in the MOU – the federal government and First Nations.

Will there be advisory groups formed at the forum?

KF – The idea of the forum is to get people's ideas.

Will we see you back here after the forum? We saw your advert in the newspaper. If someone didn't know about PNICMA, they wouldn't have known about this meeting or that it affects them.

KF – We have heard this.

In regards to reading the information before the question period, it would have been good to have the information before this meeting. We could have come with different, more informed questions. For the future, please make this type of information available before the meetings.

The information was posted on the website

With areas being carved up and planned for in PNICMA, how will this impact future development and preservation? Will this follow a 'log and talk' approach?

SD – These questions need to be asked at the forum.

AF – Would you like to see an adaptable process?

RCA, NMCA, wind farms, pipelines are all going forward during PNCIMA. How does this process address these future processes?

Does this process create a moratorium?

Or will it be full bore ahead?

Yes, it will continue; the governance committee has no vision for that.

Things that shouldn't happen will happen during the PNCIMA process.

AF – This is what needs to be built into the process: the vision and issues and how to adapt.

I hope that you will be addressing the grandfathering process for tenures and permits, etc. We need a written process on how to do this. It needs to be addressed up front so it is not dealt with in an ad hoc fashion in the future. We don't need the legislation to be playing catch up.

Existing tenures will not be affected.

What about things that are in the works? Could this process bring new economic development to a standstill? Will this create a moratorium?

The province needs to be a real player.

How is this process mandated? Who has the comprehensive authority?

KF – The Oceans Act states that DFO will lead and facilitate this process, and all authorities need to be involved.

Things will continue then.

March 26th is premature. You will be missing a key player (the province). We will have a difficult time dealing with tenures issued by the province. This process could have problems meshing with the province.

SD – The PNCIMA process will not circumvent existing process/regulatory authorities, but will instead inform them. It is intended to compliment them, not undermine them.

Has the province been invited? And what was their response?

KF – Their response: We are listening.

The PNCIMA process brings together regulatory authorities to work together.

Two of your documents don't mesh in terms of the size of PNCIMA (the outline document and one of the reports).

I have concerns and questions. Why has there not been any stakeholder engagement yet? I can't practically make it to a meeting. Is there a mechanism for regional discussions? Come to our communities.

(Support from audience)

Thank-you for coming out here. You say the province is not engaged but they are listening. There is no-one from the province here. Who are they listening to? DFO, the secretariat? The stakeholders? Not us here tonight. Will they be in Vancouver?

SD – They are present at the meetings. The documents reflect their comments.

For the advisory process, have you contacted the advisory committees that DFO set up? I haven't heard anything from the salmon, urchin or geoduck groups.

KF – The tuna, sablefish, halibut and Sport Fish Advisory Board have been contacted.

What are the key issues for this area? How much pressure are you getting to drill oil? Has DFO been researching this?

There is a correlation between the environmental protection area (from David Anderson) and the boundaries of PNCIMA. Where did this boundary come from?

KF – The boundaries are based on marine ecoregions determined nationally by DFO Science.

In identifying stakeholders, did you contact any recreation groups? Scuba divers etc?

The borders are fine, they encompass one resource

This is a very large and diverse area in terms of stakeholders and uses. Where is the money to fund this process?

In our LOS PNCIMA booklet, we have identified 36 000 people in this region. You need to recognize the little guys, the small hard working operations. You need to ensure that they are included; they need to have access to PNCIMA, otherwise they will drop through the cracks, and they need to be involved.

AF – What would you suggest to prevent this?

Talk to my friends :O)

Are all stakeholders equal? No. I've made my livelihood here. I have a vested interest in this area. How do you intend to involve the stakeholders with vested interests? The livelihood people, the people who's lives will be impacted by these decisions.

I am concerned about the absence of ecotourism (whale watching etc). What kind of in-house experience do you have to look at international models similar to

PNCIMA? Have any in-house positions been assigned? Do you have an acknowledged body, FTE, assignment?

SD – We will discuss international models at the forum.

KF – We have an MPA planner.

Only one?

KF – We have one MPA planner dedicated to the sponge reef AOI but also a federal/provincial MPA Implementation Team under the MOU between Canada and the province on the oceans. They will help develop a network of MPAs. There is more than one. There are dedicated people to meet the existing and future demands.

AF – To clarify, you are saying, let's not reinvent the wheel, let's use existing expertise?

Have you engaged the larger players, cruise ships, and gas for example? Are they taking part in the process?

KF – We have been meeting separately with the large players.

Will this process see everyone together?

KF – This will happen at the forum. The objective of these small meetings is to get people involved in and aware of PNCIMA. This is simply the beginning of the process.

Will the sectors be at the forum?

Will Naikun and Enbridge have meetings beyond the forum?

KF – Only to the same degree that we are meeting with you today.

As a stakeholder, I would like to see the integrated use of traditional knowledge, local knowledge (from fishermen, for example), scientific knowledge and DFO knowledge.

Will universities be on board? Will they be invited to the forum?

KF – They are included in the non governmental science.

What is the current position on tanker traffic? Will PNCIMA make the ultimate decision?

SD – Currently there is an exclusion zone.

Is this penciled at will, or will PNCIMA decide?

SD – There is a process that is currently managing the issue of tanker traffic. The PNCIMA process will inform this.

Do you have baseline economic impact data for the region? Will this be part of the PNCIMA process? We need good, reliable economic data.

KF – This has not been done yet and will be contracted to experts.

The web-casting will be beneficial to bring people into this process.

Will the minutes be shared, from the forum and tonight?

SD – They will be posted on the web.

Commitment is key. It is important that the minister is present at the forum. The ESSIM plan is still sitting on the Minister's desk after consensus was reached with the public.

KF – The reason this has not been signed is political, but it is still moving forward.

The minister is responsible. You need to build moral capital, be real honest and open. You can't just say you are listening. We have heard rumors about the province: issues over the seabed, money, commitment, the process being dumped on them.

We won't go to MPs because we don't know if you are being honest. You need to put the issues on the table, don't hide behind it, be transparent.

SD – The province has not said anything regarding their status in the PNCIMA process.

DFO needs credibility to build trust and buy in to the process. If there is consensus on PNCIMA, how will this be implemented? I have an office full of unimplemented plans. This first stage has been shoved down people's throats. The credibility of DFO in this region is not good. You need to build trust, voices need to be heard.

We need the cooperation of all levels of government. Many studies have been done for smaller planning areas with lots of resources and commitment. It is an issue that the province is only an observer. We all need to be at the table together. Both of the governments are needed, working together. Without both, I don't believe this planning process will come together.

You should provide gas money for the Victoria folks who came here

We're pressuring the province for discussions. It is difficult to move forward without them as it looks like the province is stalling the process. The First Nations have been pushing for all of this for years and we are not going to let it fall off the table.

In the schematic, Nisga'a have a seat at the Steering committee.

One of our guiding principals is the inclusion of meaningful engagement with stakeholders. It was First Nations who put this forward. First Nations will keep DFO in line. We need transparency for this process; open, documented, and tracked decisions shared by all.

Does the steering committee come to a consensus for its decisions?

We will seek to develop recommendations through consensus

I don't care if the province joins in. Right now we will work with DFO and we will build a strong dog so it doesn't go back and fourth between the province and federal government like in the CCLRMP. That didn't work, so we kicked out the feds. We need to know what we are looking for before we get two governments together. We need to get started. We have a 3-5 year process ahead of us, which is a long time for the province to come in. We don't want to get caught in the crossfire and then see how the province can integrate.

Once you have the recommendations, engage the regional districts. We are going to have to sit back and see what happens. The ball is in DFO's court and we are leery. Convince us to be part of the process.

How will the steering committee be responsible to the stakeholder? Who is listening to me? **I want a representative on the committee.** There is a level of accountability to hear us. Involving the local governments is a start, but stakeholders should be included as well. If we come vent, and that is the last of it, then consultation is not meaningful. We need to be represented at a higher level or this is meaningless.

We elect our municipal governments, we should make our concerns known to them. Citizens at a basic level can feed into the process if the municipal governments feed in. They are the best representatives for coastal towns. Municipal governments need to be involved.

We need to start with a free for all, and from this a sectoral model will build. 180 people is not reasonable for all meetings, but people need to buy in and know that someone is representing their interests.

In the beginning we will have everyone, and then we will scale down (the budget will not be able to handle the high numbers). The stakeholders will need to choose their own representative to feel included.

The representatives will hear everyone.

Let people vent, then let the dust settle. Government will be the representative. I hate the word stakeholder – it is overused and under respected. The municipal government is overtaxed, but we could help out in the process to represent people. The regional districts have been working on, developing, and encouraging a relationship with First Nations. Together we have a chance of

Port Hardy, March 5th

success, divided we do not. The regional district represents **everyone** who lives here, including First Nations. We don't want to create a monster, but there needs to be involvement.

Has the MP been invited to pass our message to Ottawa?

Yes

You need to make this more user friendly if you want comments and opinions. I had to take off work to come here. The weekends would be better. The little guys can't take the time off.