



Advancing Watershed Sustainability in BC

WORKSHOP REPORT



March 18, 2014 Workshop | Vancouver BC



Table of Contents

A. Advancing Watershed Sustainability in BC.....	3
B. Working Group Discussions	6
1. Effective Watershed Management	6
2. Towards a Vision of Sustainability for Watersheds	7
3. Ecosystem Indicators.....	9
4. Capacity and Accountability for Shared Decision-Making	11
5. Natural Resource Practices Board.....	13
6. Funding and Delivery Models	13
C. Conclusions.....	14
D. Appendices.....	15
Appendix 1: Workshop Agenda	15
Appendix 2: Participant List.....	17

A. Advancing Watershed Sustainability in BC

The BC Wildlife Federation (BCWF), in conjunction with funding from the Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation is undertaking a project to advance watershed conservation and sustainability throughout BC. BCWF is delivering the project in partnership with the Fraser Basin Council (FBC). In addition, many other organizations and individuals, representing a diversity of perspectives, experiences and expertise, were engaged in various ways throughout year-one (Fall 2013 – Spring 2014) of this three-year project.

This initiative arose from a concern, shared by many, that watershed ecosystems in BC are losing their resilience and sustainability. The long-term health of watersheds is key to ensure the sustainability of the ecosystems, communities and economies that depend upon them. However, over the years, land and water use decisions and activities have resulted in the gradual loss of ecological function in watersheds including degradation of habitat, declining water quality, inadequate flows for environmental values, and conflict among different sectors that depend upon water. Though there are many diverse organizations and jurisdictions working on the stewardship, management, planning and governance of watersheds and water resources, there is still a need for enhanced coordination and collaboration among these efforts.

The goal of this project is to educate British Columbians on the importance of watershed sustainability and protecting BC's diverse and unique aquatic resources. It also aims to help strengthen capacity in BC to achieve healthy watersheds by considering watershed health and sustainability through several different lenses, or sub-projects. The focus of the sub-projects facilitated by the Fraser Basin Council include the following:

1. Vision of Watershed Sustainability – Develop a unifying vision of sustainability for watersheds and landscapes through a collaborative process that engages First Nations organizations and non-governmental conservation organizations.
2. Watershed Management Actions – Conduct research on the roles, responsibilities and actions required to effectively manage the health and sustainability of BC's watersheds, including an assessment of capacity, challenges and opportunities.
3. Funding and Delivery Models – Conduct research and develop recommendations on funding and delivery models needed to advance watershed health and sustainability at local and regional scales throughout BC.
4. Capacity and Accountability for Shared Decision-Making = Conduct research and develop recommendations regarding capacity requirements and accountability mechanisms for shared decision-making at local, regional and watershed scales.
5. Natural Resource Practices Board – Conduct research and develop recommendations regarding a Natural Resource Practices Board to provide advice

on effective, science-based management of natural resources including independent performance audits and reporting.

6. Indicators of Watershed Health – Conduct research and develop a set of indicators to measure the health of watershed and estuarine ecosystems throughout BC.
- 7. Workshop for Advisors and Practitioners – Plan, deliver and co-host a workshop to present key findings to date and facilitate dialogue and feedback.**

Each of the projects outlined above are intended to focus on a particular aspect of watershed management. (e.g. vision, management, governance, capacity, oversight, funding, etc.). However, these different aspects can also be seen as distinct pieces of a more complex and interconnected puzzle. The following is intended to illustrate how the different pieces fit together.

1. **Vision** – What are our needs, aspirations and goals for our watersheds?
 - Project - Vision of Watershed Sustainability
2. **Implementation** – What actions do we take to achieve our vision?
 - Project – Watershed Management Actions
 - Project – Capacity and Accountability for Shared Decision-Making
3. **Resources** – What human and financial resources do we allocate – and how – to most efficiently and effectively manage watersheds and achieve our vision?
 - Project – Funding and Delivery Models
4. **Evaluation and Performance Management** – How can we best assess progress towards achieving our vision of healthy watersheds and what auditing and reporting mechanisms can assist?
 - Project – Indicators of Watershed Health
 - Project – Natural Resources Practices Board

Note: the highlighted project above indicates the focus of this particular discussion paper.

Acknowledgements

The project – Advancing Watershed Sustainability in BC – would not be possible without generous contributions from the BC Wildlife Federation and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. A special thanks also to the various advisors, reviewers, and information sources that enabled the project team to advance this work. Thank you all for your generous support.

Introduction to the Workshop – Advancing Watershed Sustainability in BC

The Advancing Watershed Sustainability Workshop was held on March 18, 2014 in Vancouver BC. The workshop objectives were:

- To present the key findings and recommendations from the watershed sustainability project.
- To facilitate dialogue and input on the key findings and recommendations from the project to date.
- To facilitate opportunities for networking and sharing knowledge and experiences.

The workshop represented a milestone near the end of the first year of the project and the following six sub-projects:

- Watershed Management Activities
- Sustainability Vision
- Watershed Indicators
- Capacity and Accountability for Shared Decision Making
- Natural Resources Practices Board
- Funding and Delivery Models

Each sub-project was presented in a plenary session in the morning, with space for comments and suggestions. The workshop presentations can be accessed through the following link:

http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/Library/Water/ws_fbc-bcwf_watersheds_march_2014.pdf

Participants were then invited to discuss the projects in greater depth in 1-hour long discussion sessions throughout the afternoon. Participants had the opportunity to discuss two of the six projects in detail. The discussions and participants' comments affirmed the general direction, focus and recommendations of the project, and demonstrated a commitment to addressing watershed sustainability issues in a coordinated and comprehensive manner.



This report outlines and summarizes the key points gleaned from discussions at the workshop. In each break-out session, participants were asked to deliberate on four questions related to the project, which included topics such as top priorities, appropriate geographic scales, recommendations to address gaps, and fresh ideas and suggestions moving forward. While some groups answered all questions, some had more in-depth discussions on one or two of the questions. The report summarizes the key points made in each discussion group.

B. Working Group Discussions

1. Effective Watershed Management

Top Priorities for watershed management activities

A key theme discussed with regard to effective watershed management was education and awareness. Outreach should focus on helping people become aware of past and present watershed issues, and should provide a general understanding of management activities and of how personal actions affect watersheds. Objectives must be clearly defined regarding what is to be managed, and which tools are to be used. For example, water security is an issue to manage towards, and can be measured using an index or indicator of some kind. Watershed management should also involve science when dealing with watershed issues, and can link management activities with reporting.

Most significant gaps and limitations identified in resourcing watershed management activities

A number of gaps were identified in this working group related to watershed management. The lack of scientific data, and a related lack of data credibility, to inform management, topped the list of concerns. One suggestion was to provide technical training to communities to collect their own data and build datasets that can be utilized both locally and more broadly to assess cumulative effects. These datasets could include water indicators but also information on land-use, impervious surfaces, mapping, riparian areas and risks of vulnerability within communities. There is a need to perform comprehensive watershed analyses to include other affected sectors, such as riparian areas. Oversight of data collection and analysis would be a key component to ensure high data quality.

Democratic governance is important when addressing management issues, yet appears to be absent in many cases. Some participants identified a lack of general consensus in watershed management, although this could relate to low engagement and awareness of watershed issues listed earlier. Another gap identified was the important linkages between management activities, such as water licensing, and monitoring/reporting. If these areas of management operate independently, there is the potential for problems.

Finally, legitimacy was noted as a limitation in watershed management; grassroots and watershed organizations are not fully representative or consensus based, yet can be tasked with undertaking a suite of management roles. There are different forms of legitimacy that can be applied to various types of decision-making; these could be explored in more detail.

Recommendations and/or examples to address key gaps and limitations

Some recommendations identified by the group to address the gaps and limitations were for an economic valuation of water to ensure its protection, such as greater promotion and uptake of “salmon-safe” education. There is a need to balance the management of “hot-spots”, but also the more moderate impact areas throughout the watershed, such that these areas do not become hot-spots. The inclusion of grassroots groups, watershed organizations, and First Nations communities in the decision-making process can help to ensure better and fairer representation of all interested sectors. Water management consensus will also help to provide legitimacy in decision-making process and improve management practices.

Innovative and Refreshing Ideas

Some ideas that emerged from the group discussion included:

- educate the public (citizens, government agencies, politicians) about the importance and relevance of water;
- establish a compassionate system that provides an emotional connection with water issues. For example, community dialogues and watershed cafes, and use of the arts and other creative outlets to educate and engage;
- improve data collection and undertake better analysis to translate into optimal watershed practices;
- improve collaboration with groups interested in watershed management;
- design “democratic” governance mechanisms to better connect and integrate watershed advocates, research institutions and government agencies; and
- manage green water (e.g. rainfall/rainwater) to achieve gains in water management, such as evapotranspiration and grey water resource recovery.

2. Towards a Vision of Sustainability for Watersheds

There was recognition in this group that a vision is a means to build buy-in towards a common goal, and that the process of developing a vision is equally important as the vision itself. There was also recognition that any vision for watershed sustainability must be framed in a context that is understood by primary water users. Words used to describe a vision included ‘broad’, ‘general’, ‘inclusive’ (environmental, social, economic and cultural), ‘ecosystem services’, ‘resilience’ and ‘connection’. Participants identified the need for clearer definitions regarding the proposed vision, such as the context (i.e. water for whom, what constitutes a watershed), whether this vision will include citizen use of water, and natural systems usage.

Examples of watershed sustainability visions

Some examples of watershed sustainability visions discussed included the Coquitlam River Watershed Roundtable, and the provincial water vision set forth in the Water Sustainability Act. However, in the latter example, it was noted in the group that First Nations do not share this vision. There are missing pieces such as cultural values, principles and operating statements to articulate what ‘values’ mean.

Geographic scale to develop a watershed sustainability vision

The geographic scale of a watershed sustainability vision should be broad, and perhaps provincial, yet must be connected to a place and the resources therein. It must encompass the values and priorities that underpin both urban and rural interests, and span across the many lines that divide us as British Columbians. Defining boundaries is not merely a technical exercise; not all jurisdictions fit within a singular geographic scale, and every scale option could consider political, economic and social and ecosystem perspectives. A vision should also encompass the values and input from BC’s First Nations groups, as well as industrial and conservation interests. There is an inherent tension between ensuring a vision is inclusive of a multitude of values and backgrounds, and ensuring that it has meaning, and ‘speaks’ to those under its purview. At too small a scale, it does not reach broadly enough or attempt to solve watershed issues; yet at too high a scale, a vision may be excessively broad, diluting any real meaning to people under the vision. Striking this balance in creating a vision is a challenging exercise. The group also noted that the vision should be connected to decision makers in some way, to ensure that future laws are written in accordance with any vision that has been agreed upon.

Organizations best suited to the implementation of a watershed sustainability vision

The key organizations that should be involved in the implementation of a watershed sustainability vision are those organizations that are best able to keep it moving and monitor progress toward achieving the vision. Organizations able to make decisions (e.g. local governments), as well as parties that have an interest in general, should be included. However, this question relates back to the question of scale, and meaningful engagement is highly dependent on geographic scale, as well as capacity and interest level.

New, Innovative and Refreshing suggestions

The group identified that place-based visioning is critical, and if it is to have any meaning, it must include First Nations as a cornerstone. The group was hopeful of a broader, global vision that provides a different way of seeing things, and that may guide decision making regarding the allocation of resources.

3. Ecosystem Indicators

Ecosystem indicators provide an important and relevant tool to understand the state and trends regarding environmental health. This sub-project is well underway, and has identified a list of indicators that represents the past and current availability of data to be used in assessments of ecological health.

Important uses of watershed indicators and information

The discussion group on indicators emphasized the need for a distinction between primary and secondary indicators, and for clarity regarding the context for indicator use. Indicators are useful in a variety of important ways, including:

- Decision making
- Public education
- Informed planning processes
- Assessing state of the watershed
- Determining baseline information
- Project/programming evaluation
- Assigning priorities
- Ensuring effective of management practices
- Defining expected results and outcomes
- Motivate action towards a goal

Useful geographic scales for the implementation of watershed indicators

There is a tension that exists regarding the scale at which indicators are collected, measured and utilized. On the one hand, information at the ecosystem level is important to understand and effectively address cumulative effects, as well as create a platform for local ecosystem priorities. However, data is not uniformly collected in each watershed at this scale, and is rarely transferrable to other watersheds and ecosystems. Participants noted a need for definitions of watershed boundaries before determining which indicators to pursue, and that a ‘toolbox’ of indicators might be more useful than a prescriptive list. Some members of this group noted that the Chilliwack watershed works well as a medium-scale watershed, whereas broader scale watersheds such as the Fraser might be useful for larger indicators such as land-use changes. Some noted that it is important to determine and articulate goals and results to be achieved under each of the 5 themes of water quality and quantity; fish and wildlife; ecosystems; resource use; and resource conservation.

The framework includes both “leading” and “lagging” indicators for conservation planning. Leading indicators are aggregate level indicators, such as how much spawning habitat has been protected or restored, whereas lagging indicators focus on finer scale metrics such as the number of fish present. DFO conservation units were proffered as a scale of choice; however these units are coarse and may not be appropriate at a sub-watershed scale. Small-scale metrics can be integrated into larger indicators and combined with landscape indicators.

Organizations best suited to implement a watershed indicators framework

A wide variety of organizations were put forth as suitable to implement a watershed indicators framework. Some included provincial and local governments, First Nations groups, and regional districts or groups of them that make up one watershed. The Okanagan Basin Water Board provides an example of regional districts working together to collect information of broad interest. The OBWB provides a notable example, as they collaborate to collect aerial imagery and use it in the management of the entire basin, which spans 3 regional districts. The Skeena Knowledge Trust is currently collecting and building a dataset as a way of planning for impacts on biodiversity.

Some members of this group suggested that a body or organization is needed to house all of the information collected, and to make it readily available for watershed groups. A portal for the data could be created, and data could be analyzed by this central organization. A geospatial data warehouse currently exists, after which a central data storage system could be modeled. First Nations groups could also benefit from such a repository of data to assist and support their planning processes.

Innovative, Refreshing or Actionable Ideas

A targeted set of indicators for watershed groups to collect information would be useful, and could utilize citizen science for both capacity and building engagement and buy-in. The scope of relevant indicators must be determined at the scale of reference. A short list of indicators and associated targets should be established to get moving, and this list could be supplemented at a later date; ensuring a perfect plan prior to execution, it is important to generate early momentum. Members of the group recognized that tracking progress against targets or standards is an important practice, and also that collaboration and commitment from multiple parties is necessary to build a solid set of indicators with which to inform decisions.



4. Capacity and Accountability for Shared Decision-Making

With the introduction of the Water Sustainability Act to the BC Legislature earlier this spring, there is the potential for a range of governance approaches to be enabled across the province. But if watershed organizations and regional entities are to expand their governance roles, questions of capacity and accountability arise: to what degree do watershed groups have the capacity to take on additional watershed decision-making roles? How are these groups to be held to account? What types of decisions are most appropriate to be made at this scale, and which should remain with existing orders of government? What types of decisions are appropriate to engage local communities and stakeholders for input, but that are best made at higher levels?

Several characteristics and mechanisms were identified in this discussion group that should be considered for watershed governance and decision-making:

- Transparency and accountability mechanisms, such as evaluation, democratically elected representatives, accessible material and documentation of decisions
- Terms of reference articulating roles and responsibilities
- Accountability to scientific inputs, vulnerable groups and general public
- Administrative fairness
- Open houses to inform the public
- Capacity building, through networking and sharing of data

Appropriate types of decisions for shared decision-making at local /regional watershed scales

This group identified a number of decisions or types of decisions that might be appropriate for watershed scales. Some of these included decisions relating to the health of the watershed, watershed plans and planning processes, and handling of invasive species. Some types of decisions would benefit from shared decision-making or strong local input, such as industrial water use licenses, but it was acknowledged that much of the decision-making depends on the size of the watershed. In water permitting or licensing situations, it may be possible to consult local watershed organizations for recommendations. Issues of accountability and information sharing have been raised: if decisions are made regarding a watershed, who is held accountable, and how can citizen access information regarding watershed decisions? Group members identified accountability for risk as a concern, as local people live with risks associated with watersheds, yet it is relatively unknown who is accountable for that risk. Participants want to know that the province will share in this risk.

Important aspects of organizational capacity to ensure successful shared decision-making in BC watersheds.

Recognition of shared interests between stakeholders is an important feature of successful shared decision-making. Integrating considerations of multiple uses of watersheds is a critical aspect of watershed governance that can help to assess the broader impact of water usage. Access to information and quality data are also empowering in terms of enabling shared decision-making. Developing trustful relationships within the community is foundational to any work in watersheds, such that legitimacy can be attained, and cooperation can occur. Shared decision making can also benefit greatly from the networks of the people around the table.

Accountability mechanisms to ensure successful shared decision-making

Capacity, education and engagement were listed as underpinning components of shared decision-making to ensure awareness of decisions being made in a given watershed, and thus ensuring accountability. Access to credible scientific information, in addition to local and traditional knowledge is valuable in terms of being accountable to all interests and watershed users. Finally, accountability entails specific outreach and equity measures for vulnerable populations are supported.

The Coquitlam River Watershed Roundtable has several accountability mechanisms that help to maintain legitimacy with the community, and its functionality as a watershed organization. The Core Committee is a small group that represents the interests in the watershed; working groups stem from this Core Committee on a volunteer basis. Each Core Committee member is accountable to his or her respective group or community; they are responsible for obtaining input and bringing information back to the Committee. All roles are enshrined in governance documents that are commonly referred to and publically accessible to ensure transparency. The Coquitlam Roundtable has 2 meetings per year that are open to the public.

Innovative, Refreshing and Actionable Suggestions

The Columbia Basin Trust (CBT) offers an innovative and independent example, with sustained funding, climate change planning and water conservation plans. The Coquitlam River Watershed Roundtable also provides a robust example. There are many models of both urban and rural organizations to use as examples and gain wisdom from. These organizations have led the charge, moving ahead of the province and building legitimacy and decision-making authority from the ground up. While these tables take time to see tangible progress, they are capable of accomplishing great things once relationships among varying interests have been fostered.

5. Natural Resource Practices Board

Comments on expanding the jurisdiction of the Forest Practices Board to establish a more broadly focused Natural Resource Practices Board

There was general consensus among participants in this session that expanding the jurisdiction of the Forest Practices Board (FPB) to more broadly encompass natural resources is a sound approach to explore further; however, there was also a general uncertainty regarding the suite of responsibilities of the FPB, and its effectiveness at undertaking these responsibilities; thus, it is worth exploring these aspects further. There was consensus among the group that more outreach and education surrounding the work of the FPB is desired. Questions and reservations that arose included:

- Would there be a NRPB certification, and if so, what levels would be included?
- What would the allocation of funding look like?
- What would be the extent and nature of responsibilities?
- Where might this fit within all of the current legislation and responsibilities for natural resource management?
- How might this balance the public interest and resource development interests?

Significant benefits and challenges of establishing a Natural Resource Practices Board

Some of the benefits of a natural resources practices board that were identified by the group included cumulative effects identification and management, enhanced performance (perhaps due to breaking down of silos), greater public confidence and social license, independence, a standardized decision making process and set of practices for all (or most) resource management in the province, and a level playing field. There were a number of challenges raised with regard to the implementation of a natural resources practices board. One was the question of jurisdiction and authority, especially in areas that may overlap with the jurisdiction of the National Energy Board, the Fisheries Act, or other overarching bodies or legislation. There was a question of which resources might be included in the board, and where to draw the line. For example, would wind farms be under the purview of a new board? Other challenges and questions raised included audit independence, possible overlap with current activities, and how a board of this kind would operate in conjunction with transportation and infrastructure, and railway construction.

6. Funding and Delivery Models

Strengths and limitations of historic and current funding models

The group discussing funding and delivery models acknowledged that this is a key area to focus on, and there was emphasis on the need for staff of funding organizations to be local, and support NGOs and local governments. Too often, staff members in these organizations are focused only on reviewing proposals and main objectives of grants, rather than engaging with the community served, and building capacity. One key

limitation of current funding arrangements is the structure of the funding landscape as a suite of narrow “stove-pipes” of funders, rather than broad funders with multiple streams. This adds complexity and misalignment of applications, templates and timelines. Because many NGOs are stretched thin as it is, this “stove-pipe” landscape of funders can create a cumbersome process of applying for funds.

Examples of effective means of delivering watershed stewardship and sustainability on the ground

Stewardship Works! provides an excellent definition of “core funding” and explores the many benefits of core funding for organizations, such as continuity of staff and programming, staff time to apply for grants, and office supplies. Some examples of effective means of delivering watershed stewardship and sustainability included the Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program, and the East Kootenay Regional District Land Parcel Tax. The Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program has clearly defined priority species, activities and objectives, and this is a credible and transparent source of funding. The Regional District Land Parcel Tax is locally based, funds conservation and environmental work on an annual basis, and helps leverage other funders.

Ideas for future funding models to advance watershed sustainability

Any new funding models or programs should include staff support for applicants, such as technical advice, capacity building support, and mentorship, as an accompaniment to funding role. Long-term partnerships could lend themselves well to better funding relationships and improved capacity overall. As expected, core funding and continuity of both funding and data were themes that were discussed. Water purveyors may be a source of funding, notably for source protection and watershed health and water related infrastructure. Water pricing, as well as incentives for good stewardship efforts may help promote watershed sustainability work. NGOs can work with regional districts to inform planning, regional growth strategies and priority setting.

C. Conclusions

The Advancing Watershed Sustainability in BC Workshop on March 18, 2014 was an affirmation of the importance of undertaking this suite of projects aimed to advance watershed sustainability. While the reporting out on the 6 sub-projects was critical to bring a cross-section of advisors and practitioners up to speed on this initiative, the discussion groups allowed for a much deeper exploration of these topics. Many helpful comments and suggestions emerged from the discussion groups, such as some good examples that can guide the work, challenges that may hinder progress, and refreshing ideas that can be incorporated and developed as the BCWF and FBC move these projects forward.

D. Appendices

Appendix 1: Workshop Agenda

WORKSHOP – ADVANCING WATERSHED SUSTAINABILITY IN BC

March 18, 2014 (9:00 am – 4:00 pm)
Simon Fraser University – Harbour Centre, Room 1400
555 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, BC

Workshop Objectives:

- To present the key findings and recommendations from the watershed sustainability project.
- To facilitate dialogue and input on the key findings and recommendations from the project to date.
- To facilitate opportunities for networking and sharing knowledge and experiences.

AGENDA

- 8:30 am On-Site Registration, Refreshments and Networking
- 9:00 am Welcome, Opening Remarks & Project Overview
- 9:20 am Plenary Presentations
- Roles & Responsibilities for Effective Watershed Management
 - Towards a Vision of Sustainability for Watersheds
 - Indicators to Measure & Assess Watershed Ecosystem Health
- 10:20 am Refreshment Break**
- 10:40 am Plenary Presentations
- Implementing Watershed Governance – Mobilization, Capacity and Practicalities
 - Capacity & Accountability for Shared Decision-Making
 - A Proposed Natural Resources Practices Board
 - Collaborative Funding & Delivery Models for Watershed Stewardship
- 12:00 noon Lunch**
- 12:45 pm Overview of Afternoon Dialogues
- 12:50 pm Breakout Groups:
- Watershed Management Activities (Room 1420 – Back)
 - Sustainability Vision (Room 1410 – Middle)
 - Watershed Indicators (Room 1400 – Front)
- 1:50 pm Breakout Groups:

- Capacity and Accountability for Shared Decision Making (Room 1410 – Middle)
- Natural Resources Practices Board (Room 1400 – Front)
- Funding and Delivery Models (Room 1420 – Back)

2:50 pm **Refreshment Break**

3:00 pm Highlights from Breakout Groups

3:45 pm Concluding Remarks & Wrap-Up

4:00 pm Adjourn

Appendix 2: Participant List

First Name	Last Name	Organization or Affiliation:
Alan	Martin	BC Wildlife Federation
Amy	Greenwood	Fraser Basin Council
Andrea	Barnett	Ducks Unlimited
Blaire	Chisholm	Coquitlam River Watershed Roundtable
Bob	Purdy	Fraser Basin Council
Brad	Mason	Community Mapping Network
Cecilia	Wong	Environment Canada
Christina	Cook	Independent Consultant
Christopher	Carter	University of British Columbia
Clea	Moray	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Costanza	Testino	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Craig	Orr	Watershed Watch Salmon Society
David	Marshall	Fraser Basin Council
Dianne	Ramage	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Eileen	Jones	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Elaine	Willis	Coquitlam River Watershed Roundtable Core Committee
Erik	Karlsen	
Gemma	Dunn	Ishka Consulting
Gretchen	Harlow	Stewardship Centre for BC
Hans	Schreier	UBC
Ian	Rogalski	Environment Canada - West and North
James	Casey	WWF-Canada
John	Pennington	Forest Practices Board
Katrina	Connors	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Kiely	McFarlane	University of British Columbia
Lee	Hesketh	
Leila	Harris	UBC, PoWG
Lindsay	Gardner	Fraser Basin Council
Melissa	Chaun	Tri-City Green Council
Neil	Fletcher	BC Wildlife Federation
Oliver	Brandes	POLIS
Pamela	Zevit	South Coast Conservation Program
Rob	Knight	Community Mapping Network
Sandy	Budd	Maple Creek Watershed Society
Sarah	Atherton	Langley Environmental Partners Society (LEPS)
Steve	Litke	Fraser Basin Council
Steve	Kux	BCWWA
Susi	Porter-Bopp	Canadian Freshwater Alliance
Theresa	Fresco	Fraser Basin Council

Timothy
Tina
Wayne
ZoAnn

Ryan
Barisky
Salewski
Morten

Forest Practices Board
UBC- School of Community and Regional Planning
NEWSS & BCWF
Pacific Streamkeepers Federation