

CRWS Project Team Meeting Notes



Chilliwack River
Watershed Strategy

Date: July 24, 2006 1:15 p.m.
Location: FVRD, Room 224

Facilitator: Marion Robinson, Fraser Basin Council

Present: Tom Cadieux, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Krista Englund, Fraser Valley Regional District/F.V.R. Watersheds Coalition
Sylvia Letay, Ministry of Environment
Kevin Walker, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands
Dave Lamson, Electoral Area E, CRAC
Graham Daneluz, Fraser Valley Regional District
Annie Dempster, Fraser Valley Regional District
Bob Stanton, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Nelson Kahama, Soowahlie First Nation

The meeting commenced at 1:20 pm.

1.0 Introduction and Acceptance of Agenda

Tom requested that the Nisqually Watershed audit be added to the agenda. The rest of the agenda was accepted as written.

2.0 Review and Acceptance of Minutes

Action Item 1: CRWS communication team to discuss communications to senior levels of governments and protocols required.

Action Item 2: Executive Meeting to discuss this issue further at a meeting the morning of September 14 at the MOE office

Action Item 3: CRWS Communications team to identify other agency newsletters suitable for these articles

Discussed under item 3.4.

Action Item 4: Krista to produce an example of what the final strategy might look like for communication/dialogue purposes

Under development.

Action Item 5: Project Team to consider expanding on the vision developed from community engagement activities to be more specific and help provide direction.

Discussed under item 3.3.

Action Item 6: Krista to think about how the backgrounder could link to the Database

Under development.

***Action Item 7:** Krista to ask Alan Kenney whether there is still funding available for Tolmie Slide and whether that funding could be used for Slesse Slide instead.*

Krista followed up with Alan Kenney, who informed her that David Lamson, Greg Wilson, himself and others would be meeting to discuss the best use of the 'clayslide funding.' Dave Lamson reported that four individuals from the Chilliwack River Action Committee met with Alan Kenney (PSF), Greg Wilson (MOE) and Rhael Finnigan (Conservation). It was decided that the \$40,000 funding would not be used for physical work this year, but would rather be allocated for studies, particularly for Tolmie Slide. The participants were to form a steering committee to generate a Terms of Reference for this study. The results can then be used to trigger future funding.

David noted that the Chilliwack River Action Committee has already raised/received \$20,000 and wanted to obtain another \$20,000 for work on Slesse Slide. The Action Committee will investigate whether they can go ahead without additional funding.

***Action Item 8:** Krista to discuss these suggestions with the Living Rivers representatives and generate a proposal for review and acceptance by the Project Team via email. Discussed under item 3.5.*

***Action Item 9:** Krista/Tom to follow up on the suggestion to get CRWS paraphernalia. There is currently no funding to support the purchase of CRWS paraphernalia.*

The minutes of the June 12th meeting were accepted as circulated.

3.0 Business Agenda

3.1 Working Group Update

Marion asked the leads of the working groups to indicate how they were progressing with their topics and whether they would be prepared to discuss their issue with the project team in September. Krista further asked whether the framework that was developed for each topic was working. Working group leads gave the following responses:

- Illegal Dumping (David Barnes lead, Graham reported in place of Dave)
 - Through the efforts initiated by Graham, Dave Barnes and others, inmates from the Ford Correctional Centre picked up garbage over two days on Bench Rd.
 - Graham is waiting for the last invoice from the transfer station. FVRD supplied funding for the garbage bags and the dumping fees (\$600).
 - Graham and Dave met with members of the Cleanup Coalition, which yielded valuable input.

Action item 1: Krista to write thank-you letter and keep newspaper article for scrapbook.

Note: Sylvia Letay and Nelson Kahama arrived.

- Flooding/Landslides (Graham Daneluz lead)
 - Nelson noted that Soowahlie is past stage two with their proposal for gravel extraction from the Chilliwack River mainstem near the reserve. He noted that the river gravel is now higher than the dyke and Soowahlie is interested in getting the river back to where it was. They are still uncertain about whether the project will proceed within this year's fisheries window, but will know in August. Vince Busto from DFO has been involved.
 - Graham intends to meet with Nelson to discuss this issue soon.

- Angling Techniques & Levels (Mark Johnson lead, Krista reported in place of Mark)
 - Mark has had discussions with others who deal with/have an interest in the issue.
 - Note that Mark indicated that the issues framework might be difficult to follow with this particular topic because of its ethical nature.

- Hatchery Production (Bob Stanton lead)
 - Bob has produced a written draft of the hatchery production issue and indicated that the framework was useful.
 - Hatchery production is a DFO responsibility (through the salmon enhancement program) and there have been successes and failures in the past from which they have learned a lot.
 - Hatcheries have been under scrutiny and DFO wants the decision making to be open and transparent.
 - DFO has involved the public regarding hatchery production through the wild salmon policy and it wants to involve the public regarding Coho production.
 - Feedback is good, but they have not got feedback from people that they expected to get feedback from. Need to rekindle interest in what they are doing at the local level.
 - Tom and Bob are making a PowerPoint about salmon production that can be used to show interested individuals and organizations to get more dialogue going (to draw-out and open-up dialogue within the community). The idea is to simplify the process so people can understand, to be transparent, clear, honest, and in line with wild salmon policy.
 - Tom is in the process of putting the PowerPoint together and will give it to Bob to review soon.

- Cultural Approaches (Marion Robinson lead)
 - Marion is exploring suitable possibilities for all interested parties
 - One suggestion was to purchase copies of the Sto:lo Atlas, which could then be made available to agencies involved with the project team.
 - Marion suggested organizing a session where people can ask all the questions they were afraid to ask before. This would provide knowledge and fact-based learning about the aboriginal rights of the people in the area.

- Knowledge Management (Tom Cadieux lead)
 - Tom has met with Graham Daneluz already and a conference call is scheduled for next week.

- IPPs (Krista Englund lead)
 - Krista met with Dawn O'Neill, Planner at the FVRD and will follow up with Vince Busto, DFO engineer and Nelson Kahama from Soowahlie.
 - It was noted that the proposal for Slesse Creek is still progressing, but the proposal for Tamihi Creek has stopped.
 - The Hatchery was consulted about the proposal for Pierce Creek.

- Species at Risk (Sylvia Letay lead)
 - The South Coast Conservation Program (SCCP) is a new program that has been initiated by the Province in partnership with many others, primarily The Land Conservancy and the Fraser Valley Conservancy. Its purpose is to coordinate and facilitate maintenance and recovery of species at risk on the South Coast.
 - Sylvia suggested that we can best serve the information needs for species at risk by promoting the SCCP website and providing a link to this website from our website and giving out the password and login in required to access BMPs and maps.
 - Most of the species at risk are found on public lands in the CRV, and so are dealt with through the Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA).
 - Sylvia noted that surveys tell us that people care a great deal about saving species at risk, however, there is relatively little interest in species at risk unless it affects a person directly. For example, to save phantom orchid, it is necessary to protect large area of forest, including the trees and fungus on which the orchid depends. Upon learning about this species through Environment Corps Landowner Contact Program, one landowner reacted negatively.
 - We need to provide opportunities for public education as there is an underlying interest in protecting species at risk.
 - Dave Lamson noted that several Electoral Area (EA) Directors raised concern about identifying species at risk on private property without first fully disclosing the potential implications of doing so. The EA Directors emphasized the need to respect private property rights.
 - Sylvia noted that there is no legal mandate to protect critical habitat and species at risk on private land yet, although the BC wildlife amendment act is in the works.
 - It is difficult to discuss implications of species at risk legislation because critical habitat has not yet been defined. Recovery teams are trying to define what critical habitat is and what a residence is.
 - The approach being taken by the senior governments is to rely on the cooperation of the landowners and the stewardship ethic. Therefore, we need to provide landowners information and have an educational discussion around species at risk. When in these situations, we can introduce what we are doing in a very strategic way.

- Recreation (Doug Wilson lead)
 - Deferred until August.

- Restoration & Enhancement (David Lamson lead)
 - Dave noted that it would be valuable to look at what has been done and what can be done to set some priorities for future funding.
 - A meeting will be coordinated with appropriate representatives from DFO, MOE, FVRD, etc to discuss this.

3.2 Strategies for Analyzing Issues & Suggesting Alternatives

Krista indicated that the framework set out for the issues and alternatives analysis may not capture every part of the analysis, which is why there is a “General Analysis” section. Within this section, it may be useful to use one or more of the following techniques to analyze the issue:

- Appreciative Inquiry Approach
Look around at what is working. “Fan the flames” of this and what you want more of will expand. Strengthen the strengths.
Suggested references: <http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/research/bibPublished.cfm>, especially articles by D. Cooperrider and D. Whitney.
- Problem solving /gap analysis/ SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats)
These approaches work for technical matters, but not so well for human relationships.
- Three-parts-to-a-solution
 - a. Structural responses – Ask the question: Do we need government legislation, rules, guidelines, or policies?
 - b. Technical response (includes traditional knowledge) – Ask the question: Do we know enough?
 - c. Cognitive response – Ask the question: How can we create knowledge and buy in. This comes down to marketing. If resources are not allocated to the cognitive level, legislation will not work and knowledge will not be used.

3.3 Developing a Vision, Goals and Objectives

Krista asked “how will we know if we have achieved anything?” and “what exactly are we working towards in the watershed?” The purpose of this agenda item was not to develop a vision and goals, but to discuss whether we want to at a future meeting (e.g. would it help our work).

Krista highlighted several key points from the article that Mark Johnson found called “Envisioning a Sustainable World” by Donella Meadows.

Key points from the discussion that ensued are contained within Appendix A.

Action item 2: The group generally agreed that we should have a session on visioning, goals and indicators. To be discussed by the communications sub-committee.

3.4 Communicating with Higher Levels

Deferred to the communications sub-committee.

3.5 Living Rivers Funding (aka Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program)

Krista synthesized the suggestions that arose from the funding brainstorm at the June meeting with the objectives of the funders into a draft proposal for the \$50,000 earmarked for the Chilliwack River Watershed Strategy from the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program. Because the brainstorm was incomplete, it was suggested that we simply state that a portion of the funds will be used for strategic action as identified by the working groups. Unfortunately, the funders were not willing to accept an open ended “action fund” and it also became clear that they were not interested in funding “actions” at all, but rather wanted to support the completion of the watershed strategy.

In response, Krista considered our current status and determined that the one limitation shared by all participants is a lack of resources to complete the necessary work. Therefore, the funding proposal was adjusted to emphasize the need for capacity (e.g. human resources). In addition, several other items were included because they could have the potential to greatly benefit our efforts to complete the strategy and communications necessary to create buy-in and awareness.

Krista asked the Project Team members if they generally support the proposal as outlined in Appendix B. The general consensus was yes.

Krista further noted that the funders had informed us that they want buy-in of all key interests in the valley including First Nations and governments. Nelson suggested First Nations will buy-in if we explain what we are doing and why. He also recommended developing educational materials, such as a brochure that emphasizes the need to keep the valley clean – and describes how we are trying to help the situation and are not seeking a claim on the valley.

Marian asked Nelson if they have ever had a watershed coordinator. Nelson said not to his knowledge. Nelson noted that if a watershed coordinator was hired, it would have to be someone not political and it would have to be seen this way (e.g. the employer is important too).

There was general agreement that an aboriginal person could help provide some of the capacity needed and might be able to better strengthen First Nations engagement.

It was noted that the new stewardship forester might be a good way to strengthen ties with the Ministry of Forests.

4.0 Consent Agenda

4.1 Project Update

Bibliography/website

We are in the process of moving the current CRWS website over to the FVRD server, which will hopefully be complete in the next few weeks.

Action item 3: Once the website transfer is complete, Krista will do a web-launch via an email. It is requested that members of the committee forward the email to respective organizations and networks.

Pierce Ponds

The project next to Pierce Creek (close to the hatchery) has already begun on dry land. To date, several berms have been built and a new spawning channel has been created. Work will continue on the project (e.g. culverts will be installed and everything will be 'hooked up') later this summer.

Nonie Creek & Chilliwack River Fertilization

Krista noted that these two projects were going ahead this summer.

Sylvia requested that the Project Team be notified of such projects earlier in the year and that details be brought forth for review. Sylvia noted that Nonie Creek is historically a trout creek and introducing salmon could impact the creek and the trout.

Action Item 4: Krista to send out more information about the proposed Nonie Creek project, the River Fertilization project and any others.

4.2 Other

Krista distributed a package showing the spatial location of First Nation reserves in the Fraser Valley and linked these reserves to their respective bands and tribal associations (e.g. Sto:lo Tribal Council, Sto:lo Nation, Ch-ihl-kway-uhk Tribe Society).

Action item 5: Marian asked Krista if she will be making a list of the "white guys", as she has with the bands. Krista agreed to send out a list.

Nisqually Watershed Audit

Tom suggests traveling to the Nisqually Watershed (south of Seattle) for a few days to conduct an audit of a watershed management process that has been underway there for many years. The idea would be for each member of the team to audit the Nisqually process from a different viewpoint (e.g. how have they worked with First Nations and local governments?). Tom visited the Nisqually a number of years ago and is interested in seeing how far they have come.

Nisqually Background:

- A watershed authority started in 1987-8. It was mandated through state legislation and they hired staff including a watershed coordinator.

- The Nisqually Watershed is similar to the Chilliwack in many ways and more complex in others (e.g. it has a research forest, gravel extraction, two dams, forestry, development, recreation, etc).
- A significant amount of money was invested in the program and we can learn from their process.

Krista asked if project team members would be interested in traveling down to the Nisqually to do a watershed audit. Some interest was shown, and this fall or next spring were suggested as potential dates.

Action item 6: Project team to discuss the suggestion of doing a Nisqually Watershed Audit at a later date.

4.3 Upcoming Events

- September 16: Sixth annual Mission Celebration of Community. Free event with over 100 booths. The theme is eat, drink, and be Mission. There will be a Lantern festival in the evening.
- October 14: Chilliwack River Action Committee's Help Habitat Fundraiser. They will be hosting a salmon BBQ and a social.
- November 16-17: Fraser State of the Basin Conference. Eight concurrent sessions will be held, including a call to action on topics such as fish, land and food.
- November 25-26: Fraser Valley Bald Eagle Festival – promises to be bigger and better this year.

Action item 7: Nelson to inform the project team of the Coastal Salish gathering for species at risk and the environment, which is to be held in Duncan this September.

5.0 Wrap Up

5.1 Next Meeting Dates/Locations

The regular project team meetings were tentatively set for the last Wednesday of each month to avoid conflicts with regular 'Monday' meetings scheduled for the FBC and Soowahlie Council.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 30 from 1-4 pm (location TBA).

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.

6.0 Summary of Action Items

Action item 1: Krista to write thank-you letter for the Ford Mountain Correctional Centre and keep the newspaper article for scrapbook.

Action item 2: The group generally agreed that we should have a session on visioning, goals and indicators. To be discussed by the communications sub-committee.

Action item 3: Once the website transfer is complete, Krista will do a web-launch via an email. It is requested that members of the committee forward the email to respective organizations and networks.

Action Item 4: Krista to send out more information about the proposed Nonie Creek project, the River Fertilization project and any others.

Action item 5: Marian asked Krista if she will be making a list of the “white guys”, as she has with the bands. Krista agreed to send out a list.

Action item 6: Project team to discuss the suggestion of doing a Nisqually Watershed Audit at a later date.

Action item 7: Nelson to inform the project team of the Coastal Salish gathering for species at risk and the environment, which is to be held in Duncan this September.

Appendix A: Points Made During Visioning Discussion

- Vision is like the polar star for navigation.
- We have already defined sustainability in our TOR – is that not a sufficient vision?
- Sustainability includes a healthy economy and a healthy valley.
- A vision would fit in within an OCP, which currently dates back to 1983 and the zoning bylaws. Would developing a vision fall under the planning department? Whatever development goes on in the river valley will make a sizeable impact on what the valley will look like in the next 30 –50 years. There has been talk of a \$50-60 million resort complex in the valley. Groups with sizable pieces of land and plans for development and treaty negotiations will have a sizeable effect on the valley.
- It was noted that Mike Watson and the Ch-ihl-kway-uhk Tribe Society do not recognize the Chilliwack River Watershed Strategy.
- Although CRWS has no legal authority, we can fan out to areas and organizations that have influence.
- We are a group of influence, we don't want power. We want to take on positive influence and positive values.
- Tom once delivered a presentation about advocacy, which rated advocacy level on a scale of 1-10, with 10 equal to terrorism. Tom suggests that we sit at a 1 –2, which is influencing. We influence towards protection (preferred) and restoration. We actively demonstrate these values.
- Tom recommends a book called “Collaborative Environmental Management: What Roles for Government?” by Tom Koontz and others. This book differentiates between actors and institutions. We try to influence both actors and institutions.
- It was noted that the Fraser Basin Council Board of Directors purposely has no power. By having no power, it can bring issues to the table and talk about them. There are already authorities at different levels of governments in place to make decisions. FBC facilitates talk between decision makers and fulfills a needed role.
- How do we make a difference, considering we have membership of FVRD, the Province, etc? We act as a clearing house that we pass to those authorities who have difficult decisions. Our strength is not having power. We provide a place for gathering information and taking this information back to individual organizations. We need to build momentum.
- If we have good relationships, we can afford to have conflict.
- We are not advocating, but rather we are influencing. The word influence is a safe word that people in our organizations can understand.
- We should not be afraid of the word advocating.
- Nelson is not here as representative for the Chi-ihl-kway-uhk Tribe Society, but rather as a representative of Soowahlie and the Sto:lo Tribal Council.
- Chi-ihl-kway-uhk Tribe Society is a society, not a legally recognized authority.
- It was noted that despite the various organizations and authorities, all First nations are related, and it is important to remember that a few hundred years ago, anthropologists came through and named the groups. It is often unclear whether there is a good reason for the divisions.
- Sylvia asked Nelson about the reasons for the division within the Sto:lo peoples:

- There are two different governments (Sto:lo Nation and Sto:lo Tribal Council)
- The split revolved around a question of money and who handles the money
- The Tribal Council lost treaty money and is unsure of how to proceed

Comments Specific to Creating a Vision:

- We sense in our hearts that we are on the same page.
- Should we have a 2-hour affirmative topic visioning session? To decide “what does the Watershed look like in the future?”
- We should always be talking about where we are going.
- As a group, we are trying to make Watershed sustainable.
- The Watershed boundaries are beyond OPC boundaries, as it includes Crown land and different levels of government.
- Visioning may be a good exercise as the group can create a vision statement, and take it back to the respective agencies to see if they agree. This would ensure agency buy-in.
- What does sustainability mean? Does it mean we want to keep the river valley the way it is? Or keep the fish coming back? Or keep having clean air and water?
- The DFO vision is fish sustainability; maybe in the future we won’t need hatcheries.
- We are constantly wrestling with the concept of sustainability and losing sleep over it. If we expand the topic, we lose our minds. Species at risk have definitive thresholds, there is no turning back once numbers are below threshold.
- We need to identify indicators.
- Salmon may not be as good of an indicator as something lower down on the food chain, such as benthic invertebrates.
- Identify fundamental indicators: Clean air and water, viable fish and wildlife
- Keep local focus
- All we have now is a basic statement of sustainability, but we also have differences. We all recognize sustainability in our own ways.
- We need to commonly agree on what sustainability is. Need local buy-in from people representing different groups.
- Does sustainability mean no change?
- Don’t think there is a static state of no-change.
- We need to be aware there is a conflict.
- Balance give and take, we all have boundaries. We can shrink our boundaries a little bit, but we’ll still have conflict. However, it can be minimized. Some conflict is good, too much conflict can overwhelm.
- Have to be open with views and what we aspire to.
- Respect others around us.
- People who live in this area accept change.
- This area is young and thus active, the valley can flex its muscles. Humans think we can disengage from this process. If we go back to a fundamental understanding of our place in this ecosystem.
- Guarantee that negotiation, compromise, and conflict is coming.

- Public and people in the valley need to be in this document draft. We will have to put caveats in the document. There will need to be compromise and negotiation. It will be a living document.
- Reference to a book on natural capital- needs to be obtained for the FVRD library. This book talks about how the economy and the environment are one and the same.
- Ecosystem services, we can borrow from this concept. This is the forum to bring these notions forward to people. We need a paradigm shift to happen.
- Our vision may be the same as a sustainability statement.

Appendix B. Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program (Living Rivers) Proposal

- Capacity (people money)
 - Watershed coordinator
 - Coordinate monthly project team meetings, organize a two-day workshop, report compiling & editing, coordinate sub-committee meetings as needed
 - Assistant and/or consultant
 - Conduct background research, prepare written drafts, review drafts, provide secretariat support for sub-committees and project team & facilitation as needed
 - Research and Communications
 - Purchase of reference info (sto:lo atlas) (~\$60/each)
 - Website transfer to FVRD (\$3-5,000)
 - Printing of final report & brochures (\$2,000-\$5,000)
 - Support
 - Food for meetings, and meeting space for 2-day workshop & 1-2 public sessions (\$1,000)
-