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1. BACKGROUND

Since 1985, the Fraser River Estuary Management Program (FREMP) has coordinated decision making concerning environmental management and economic development in the Fraser River estuary. Depending on the complexity of the issue or project, this can involve up to 30 federal, provincial and local government agencies, port authorities and First Nations. Six partner agencies contribute the financial resources to enable this mandate to be carried out. They consist of:

- Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- Environment Canada
- B.C. Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection
- Greater Vancouver Regional District
- Fraser River Port Authority
- North Fraser Port Authority

In August 1994, the partnering agencies adopted an Estuary Management Plan (EMP) for the Fraser River called *A Living Working River*. This is FREMP’s policy document and action plan. Key elements of this 113 page document consist of an overall vision, three supporting goals, nine basic principles and six action programs containing a series of targets with measurement indicators. These elements are summarized in the Workbook prepared by FREMP staff in June 2002 (see Attachment).

Every five years, the partners agreed to revisit the vision, goals and guiding principles of the Estuary Management Plan and make refinements based on ongoing monitoring and evaluation. Limited reviews were undertaken in 1997 and again in 2001. The 2001 review focussed on measurement indicators or targets used to monitor progress toward achieving applicable goals in the Estuary Management Plan. The resulting 27 page report on the 16 targets selected for monitoring represented a first step toward providing a long-term, indicator-based scientific measurement.

This was followed by a November 2001 public forum at the Fraser River Discovery Centre on monitoring the Estuary Management Plan. This well attended event featured a broad cross section of stakeholders including marine based industries, regulators, planners, scientists and community environmental organizations. The public forum and resulting document summarizing its proceedings set the stage for the current EMP updating process.
2. CURRENT EMP UPDATE

Through the Land and Water Land Use Committee, the FREMP partners are undertaking a comprehensive update of the Estuary Management Plan (EMP) starting in the fiscal year 2002-2003. This update meets the commitment to review the EMP, to reflect changing conditions in the estuary and to identify new action plans. This way, the EMP will remain a valuable management tool and continue to be relevant to its partners and many stakeholders including the public.

The current update of the EMP consists of a four phased process. Phase I consisted of an invitation in the spring of 2002 to interested people and organizations to become involved in the process.

Phase II consisted of gathering public input on how to revise the EMP. It involved a series of four workshops, each in a different municipality, undertaken in June and July of 2002. The Arlington Group Planning and Architecture Inc. assisted by Quadra Planning Consultants Ltd. were retained to facilitate these workshops, produce summaries documenting common themes and issues raised, prepare a report as an overview of all the workshops and make recommendations for future public consultation for the EMP update. This report consists of the Phase II documentation.

Future phases will involve targeted consultation with partners and stakeholders leading to a regional public consultation event in the fall of 2002. The Water and Land Use Committee has determined that the update should be linked as much as possible with the GVRD’s Sustainable Region Initiative.
3. PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

3.1 Date and Location of Workshops

Four workshops were held as follows:

- June 5, 2002   Steveston Community Centre, City of Richmond
- June 18, 2002  Wilson Centre, City of Port Coquitlam
- July 3, 2002    Bear Creek Pavilion, City of Surrey
- July 19, 2002  Fraser River Discovery Centre, City of New Westminster

The first three workshops were held in the evening starting at 7:00 p.m. The final workshop was held in the afternoon starting at 2:30 p.m. as a prelude to Fraser Fest. The length of each workshop varied from a minimum of 1 ¾ hours to a maximum of 2 ½ hours.

3.2 Notification of Workshops

Numerous steps were taken to notify potential workshop participants. They consisted of the following:

- Preparation and posting of 8 ½ x 11 coloured notices in affected municipalities (including libraries and community centres) and offices of FREMP partners;
- Posting of the notice on the FREMP web site and where possible on Partner and municipal web sites;
- The notice was sent to approximately 300 persons and organizations on the FREMP mailing list;
- For the Richmond event, the workshop was included in municipal “EnviroWeek” publications circulated within the community;
- Display ads in community newspapers in each of the affected municipalities one week prior to each workshop;
- Notices in the Datebook section of the weekly Business in Vancouver publication under the Courses, Workshops, Seminars heading; and
- Direct contact of FREMP partners and targeted groups by phone and email.
- Circulation of the notice to FREMP partners, committee members and other organizations like the Fraser Basin Council, with the request that they circulate as widely as possible.
3.3 Workshop Format

Each of the workshops followed a similar format. Joe Stott, Program Manager for FREMP, provided a welcome and an introduction to the updating process. Anna Mathewson, Water and Land Coordinator for FREMP, then provided a 10 minute PowerPoint presentation with information about FREMP, its partners, key elements in the Estuary Management Plan and need for updating the Plan.

Consultants Graham Farstad from the Arlington Group Planning and Architecture Inc. and Mike McPhee from Quadra Planning Consultants Ltd. facilitated the remainder of the workshops. A question and answer session about the updating process was held in order to address the nature of the review before delving into specific elements of the Estuary Management Plan. This varied in time up to 10 minutes depending on the number and type of questions raised.

The balance of the workshops consisted of small group discussion concerning the vision, goals and principles and action programs. The small group discussion varied in time depending on the workshop but was typically 1½ hours or more. It was originally anticipated that the small group discussion would consist of several break out groups of 10-15 persons per group depending on attendance levels. However, none of the workshops exceeded 12 participants so the creation of smaller groups for discussion purposes was not warranted.

All those participating were given a name tag and invited to introduce themselves and any organization they may be representing. All of the workshops followed the format of the Workbook that is included in the Appendix. This started with a discussion of the vision to determine if the vision is still considered valid today. The three goals were then discussed to determine if they were still appropriate or if any revisions or additions were needed. This was followed by a discussion of the nine principles broken into the three categories of Conserve and Enhance the Estuary, Integrated Management and Fairness, Equity and Accountability. The remainder of each workshop consisted of a discussion of the six action programs, the original identified targets, their current status, and the indicators used to measure progress achieved.

The 10 page Workbook was handed out to each participant at the 2nd, 3rd and 4th workshops. An abbreviated workbook was handed out to those attending the 1st workshop. Significant space for written comments was provided in each section of the Workbook. Several Workbooks were handed in with extensive comments, which were included in the applicable workshop documentation. However, most of the public input was received verbally during the small group discussions.
The discussion started with a round robin format to ensure that everyone at the table was given an opportunity to participate. Most of the ensuing discussion was based on those wishing to make comments on specific topics or issues. From time to time, the facilitator directed the discussion back to a round table format to ensure that the discussion was not dominated by a select few. Comments were recorded on a series of flip charts, which were then used as the foundation for the written workshop documentation.

### 3.4 Workshop Attendance

Attendance at the workshops ranged from a low of 7 to a high of 12 persons as noted in the following table. Total attendance excluding the consultants and staff involved in the facilitation process was 34. Two persons attended both the Surrey and New Westminster workshops. As a result, a total of 32 different persons attended the four workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attendance levels were not unexpected although a higher level of attendance would have been desirable. The time of year likely affected the level of attendance. Another factor may be a lack of issues requiring immediate attention (which is not to say they are not critically important). Also while numbers were low, many participants represented larger groups or organizations and in this way, representative input was obtained.

In terms of affiliation, 6 of those in attendance were FREMP partners, 6 were municipal councillors or staff, 12 were from environmental or community organizations, 3 were from marine industries and the remaining 7 were interested residents with no organizational affiliation.
The following table indicates the distribution at each workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FREMP PARTNERS</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL (COUNCILLORS/STAFF)</th>
<th>ENVIR./COMM. GROUP</th>
<th>MARINE INDUSTRY</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coq.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New West.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dynamics of each workshop varied according to the location and mix of participants. However, each workshop had a good cross-section of participants reflecting a range of backgrounds and perspectives. Although many strong opinions were reflected at the workshops, attention was given to the views of all those participating.

3.5 Workshop Discussion/Themes

A summary of each of the four workshops is presented on pages 19 to 46. This consists of the workshop format and main points of discussion in accordance with the Workbook structure. These were structured starting with the **Vision** for the Estuary Management Plan followed by the **Goals**, **Principles**, **Action Programs** and **Measurement Indicators**.

Each workshop had a different mix of participants and tone. The Richmond, Port Coquitlam and New Westminster workshops had a strong focus on environmental issues, while the Port Coquitlam workshop also had a strong focus on marine industrial issues. Improving public consultation and communication were key themes of the Port Coquitlam and New Westminster workshops. The Surrey workshop concentrated on the Action Programs and the challenges of meeting designated targets.

In general, there appears to be broad support for the Estuary Management Plan. Most of the comments call for a fine tuning or an expanded scope of the EMP, not a major change in direction.
Vision
To improve environmental quality in the Fraser River Estuary while providing economic development opportunities and sustaining the quality of life in and around the estuary.

“The vision needs a dynamic element in order to address and manage change.”

Participants were asked whether the original EMP vision is still valid today? The majority of workshop participants generally supported the EMP vision. However, there was some confusion as to how the goals, principles and action programs relate and contribute to the vision. Of the comments that were made on the vision, two themes emerged:

- The vision calls for an improvement in environmental quality, which should be refocused to the concept of achieving a healthy ecosystem.
- It is not clear that progress is being made toward achieving the vision.

Goals
1. Conserve and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary to sustain healthy fish, wildlife, plants and people.
2. Respect and further the estuary’s role as the social, cultural, recreational and economic heart of the region.
3. Encourage human activities and economic development that protect and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary.

“The Fraser River is an entity in itself.”
“Recognize this is a living, working river.”
“We need to improve, not just sustain fish and wildlife.”

The 3rd goal received the most attention. Numerous strong critiques from a variety of perspectives were made. Comments were made that the meaning of the goal is not clear, that it needs to be more proactive, that the goal puts too much emphasis on the economy, that more emphasis on encouraging maritime commerce is needed, and that the goal fails to recognize the impact human activity is having on global climate change. This suggests that some reformulation of this goal is warranted.

Several felt that a healthy, sustainable ecosystem should be of paramount concern to FREMP. Although mentioned in the Vision and in Goal 1, they felt that the concept of sustainability needs to be strengthened. Several suggestions were made to reword one of
the goals or add a 4th goal. Others felt that public consultation had not received adequate
attention and needed to be included in the goals or strengthened as an important principle.

The following were the most frequently mentioned themes:

- Ecosystem health/holistic outcomes essential (6)
- Improve public consultation/communication (6)
- Commerce/economic health essential (4)
- Strengthen environmental protection (3)
- Jurisdictional (3)

Specific comments are included in the workshop summaries. Note that some participants
offered more comments than others and that some overlap occurred when Workbooks
with written comments were submitted in addition to the verbal documentation.

Principles

Conserve and enhance the estuary.
1. Keep the estuary healthy.
2. Conserve and sustain the natural habitat.

Integrated management
3. Encourage multiple uses within the estuary.
4. Promote integrated decision making.
5. Establish and maintain informed management processes.

Fairness, Equity and Accountability
6. Promote and employ consensus-based decision making.
7. Provide equitable access to the estuary.
8. Establish and maintain accountable management processes.
9. Develop active partnerships with the public in management activities.

“A clear idea and model of sustainability is needed.”
“Move toward performance-based management for routine maintenance projects.
The Ports should expedite the processing of routine, low impact projects.
“Public education needs to be strengthened.”

A number of questions were raised as to the relationship between the vision, goals and
principles. Considerable confusion as to how each is applied was evident in the
comments/questions.
Key concerns were the relative lack of principles concerning environmental protection, the use of terminology (i.e. lack of reference to the health of the ecosystem, long term sustainability) and questioning how healthy the estuary really is. Considerable attention was also given to the role of public consultation and how it could be strengthened.

The following were the most frequently mentioned themes:

- Improve public communication and education (8)
- Sustainability/Ecosystem health (6)
- Strengthen public involvement (5)
- Public and Industrial access (3)
- Need for Partnerships/Cooperation (3)
- Comments about Monitoring/Outcomes (3)

**Action Programs**

The EMP contains six Action Programs with each program containing both specific and general targets that were intended to provide the means for achieving the vision, goals and principles of the Estuary Management Plan. The six Action Programs are organized around:

1. Water Quality Management
2. Fish and Wildlife Habitat
3. Navigation and Dredging
4. Log Management
5. Industrial and Urban Development
6. Recreation

Workshop participants were asked to address the following questions:

- *Do you feel these action items will advance sustainability in the estuary?*
- *Are there other specific action programs required?*
- *Have any important issues been missed?*

In addition, participants were asked to comment on the targets, in terms of

- *What targets or tasks should continue, be modified or be discontinued?*
- *Should new targets or tasks be added?*

Each of the workshops focused discussion on the six Action Programs contained with the EMP.
The first question was not really addressed by the participants. They tended to focus their attention on the original targets and their status as outlined in the Workbook. There were some suggestions for modifying or expanding the existing Action Programs, but only a few comments relating to new action programs being required. A number of issues were raised around the status of the targets. Several participants were not in agreement with the stated status as outlined in the Workbook. Also, participants were generally interested in whether FREMP was achieving what it had intended to achieve - i.e., is water quality getting better? Are the partners working well together to achieve its objectives?

**Water Quality Management**

"Water quality should be a central role. FREMP partners should use their mandates to protect water quality."

Water quality remains an extremely important issue for workshop participants. Many would like to see more emphasis on non-point sources of pollution and on new toxic chemicals that were previously undetected through sampling methods. Ongoing monitoring is a high priority and there was a call for continued concerted effort in this area as was evident during the Fraser River Action Plan (mid 1990's).

The following were the most frequently mentioned themes:

- Need to monitor for new toxic chemicals (e.g., hormones) (3)
- More emphasis needed on non-point sources of pollution (3)
- Targets are not being met (i.e., agricultural runoff) (2)
- Need coordinated monitoring programs (2)

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat**

"There is a need to link upland biodiversity and ecosystem functions and processes with the river corridor and estuary. We need to recognize upland contributions to the health of the estuary, and look at how FREMP and upland jurisdictions can further coordinate their respective management roles."

"The current emphasis in the indicators is on quantity and is confined to a very small number of species. What about other resources (e.g. salmon and sturgeon)?"

Along with water quality, fish and wildlife habitat protection is seen by many as the raison d'être for FREMP. Many workshop participants believe that while we need to protect fish and wildlife habitat, it is also important to take a broader view or an ecological perspective - that focuses on protecting important ecological functions and
processes and biodiversity. There is a realization that important ecosystem linkages exist between the river or estuary corridor and upland habitats. Some workshop participants were concerned that the indicators (e.g., areal extent of habitat) may not tell us whether or not the most productive habitat is being protected. There was interest in how the Streamside Protection Regulations under the provincial *Fish Protection Act* would be applied in the FREMP area. As with water quality, there was concern that fish and wildlife habitat be continued to be monitored and that there be more follow up with habitat compensation projects in the estuary to determine if productive habitat is being achieved.

The following were the most frequently mentioned themes:

- Focus on biodiversity and ecological functions and processes (6)
- Continued and better monitoring of habitat productivity (4)
- Need a greater variety of indicators for measuring the productivity of fish and wildlife habitat (3)
- Need to protect existing natural habitat (2)

**Navigation and Dredging**

"*Is the removal of sediment really at sustainable levels?*

"Navigational requirements are not being addressed above the Patullo Bridge. This includes dredging for channel maintenance, docks and facilities."

"Need an overall dredging plan that addresses operational dredging issues (e.g., marina operations) as well as for shipping."

"Dredging for flood protection is required."

Navigation and dredging issues were of interest to workshop participants at each of the four community workshops. Most participants were concerned with the perceived narrow focus of this action program and the targets and indicators used. It was evident that navigation and dredging mean different things to different people. There are those who are concerned with commerce on the river, and who want to see government dredging programs extended beyond the Patullo Bridge. Other workshop participants are concerned with dredge material management (i.e., ocean dumping off Point Grey) and the issue of "prop wash" dredging in marinas. Several participants questioned whether the indicator "sustainable sediment removal" is an appropriate indicator or if sediment is being removed at a sustainable level. It was pointed out that dredging also has a flood protection benefit that is often overlooked. There was discussion at one workshop around extending the sediment budget management area boundary upriver beyond Kanaka Creek to Hope.
The following were the most frequently mentioned themes:

- Appropriateness of indicator (including sediment removal at a sustainable level) (3)
- Management of dredge material (including need for a dredging plan) (3)
- Guidelines for marina and operational dredging (3)
- Dredging as a flood protection tool (2)

**Log Management**

"Log storage guidelines are being met; however, need to monitor to ensure compliance continues."

"FREMP should continue to work with other agencies to find a funding solution for maintaining the Agassiz debris trap."

"Need a wood debris management plan for FREMP area (in addition to log management guidelines)."

Workshop participants were generally pleased to learn that log storage operations in the estuary were conforming to the FREMP Log Storage Guidelines. However, there was concern expressed over the grounding of logs in some areas and it was pointed out that monitoring of log storage sites be continued to ensure that the guidelines are met. It was pointed out by one participant that the loss of log storage in the estuary has led to more shoreline erosion in some areas as stored logs helped to dissipate wave energy from boat wash. Most of the emphasis on log management has shifted to debris management because of the threat of closure of the debris trap at Agassiz. Many workshop participants suggested that FREMP continue to participate in the Debris Management Group and it was also suggested that FREMP may need to create its own debris management action program for log debris within its jurisdiction. Such a program would include a strategy for creating a debris collection and removal site and process to utilize wood and other wastes to process energy.

The following were the most frequently mentioned themes:

- Concern over loss of Agassiz debris trap (2)
- Debris management needed within FREMP area (2)
- Grounding of logs (2)
**Industrial and Urban Development**

"Ensure that shoreline sustainability is built into shoreline development."

"The aesthetics of the shoreline and viewscapes need to be addressed."

"The protection of properties requires land access for water oriented commercial and industrial uses including commercial fishing."

"There is a need for flood protection to be addressed as the protection of people and property may conflict with riparian values. A new action program around flood protection and dyking may be needed including coordination with the regional engineers advisory committee of the GVRD. " (N.B. Flood protection was also discussed in the Action Program concerning Navigation and Dredging.)

Responses to this Action Program varied among the participants, depending upon their perspective on the subject. For example, those concerned with industrial development, identified that maintaining waterfront access to the river was important, especially for traditional industries like commercial fishing. It was mentioned that FREMP is still pursuing the idea of nodal industrial development and is looking at the feasibility of moving goods by barge as an alternative to truck traffic. Other workshop participants raised the issue of encouraging more green buildings, industry and infrastructure within the estuary and were also concerned with the aesthetics of shoreline development and viewscapes. It was concluded that viewscapes had not been addressed, except in part by the FREMP Recreation Plan and the GVRD Greenways Plan. Several participants said that flood protection should be an issue for FREMP, perhaps even a new action program.

The following were the most frequently mentioned themes:

- Importance of viewscapes and aesthetics (including linkages to development proposals and the Recreation action program) (5)
- Encourage green buildings and industry (3)

**Recreation**

"What is the recreational carrying capacity of the estuary?"

"These objectives are competing with other objectives."

"Recreation use needs to be coordinated with fish and wildlife habitat management to ensure that there is compatibility between uses. Need to recognize that we can't have recreation everywhere, at all times - this reinforces the importance of ecosystem planning."

"Partnership support from FREMP should guide and encourage municipalities and partnership groups to develop a signage and interpretive program."
This action program generated a great deal of discussion and it was nearly all focused on the compatibility of recreation and environmental protection within the estuary. There was minimal discussion on recreational activities, other than it was pointed out that the Fraser River estuary could easily become an eco-tourism destination. However, even this point was raised within the context of the need to develop a plan, which protects sensitive habitat areas from over use by recreationists. There was one comment that jet skis should be banned from the estuary and another calling for the elimination of two stroke engines. Another area of discussion was around public awareness and education. Several workshop participants called for FREMP to renew its commitment in this area.

The following were the most frequently mentioned themes:

- Compatibility of recreation with other uses, including habitat protection (6)
- Increase FREMP's role in public education and awareness about the estuary (3)

**Measurement Indicators**

In 2001 FREMP published the report, *Monitoring the Estuary Management Plan* which included indicators to measure how well the EMP was meeting its goals. This report was distributed at the community workshops and the indicators were included in the Workbook for discussion purposes.

The *Monitoring the Estuary Management Plan* report provides a good summary of information and data on the overall health of the estuary. Workshop participants in general seemed to have a difficult time linking the indicators to the overall success of FREMP in meeting its stated goals, principles and action program objectives as outlined in the EMP. While not a great deal of time was spent on examining the indicators in detail at the workshops, there were some specific comments.

**Water Quality**

- Fecal coliform is cheap to measure but has limited applicability.
- E. Coli should be added as an indicator.
- New contaminants (for example, those that mimic estrogen) should be monitored.
- Water quality indicators need to be reviewed. The use of Great Blue Heron eggs may not reflect estuary conditions. Why not look more at benthic organisms?

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat**

- The current emphasis in the indicators is on quantity and is confined to a very small number of species. What about other resources (e.g. salmon and sturgeon)?
- Why aren’t we measuring age, class and health as well as numbers?
- Great blue heron populations should be monitored as indicators.
- Gulls eat garbage. This is not an indicator of ecosystem health, only of landfill abundance. What about monitoring other birds such as ospreys or purple martins?
- Christmas bird counts are not scientific.
- Perhaps focus more on the "productivity" of habitat as an indicator, not just the areal extent of habitat (e.g., more may not necessarily be better).

*Navigation and Dredging*
- The indicator should be reworded to focus on sediment removal at a sustainable level.

*Log Management*
- Include finer or smaller wood debris through storm sewers etc. as well.
- The requirement for no grounding of logs is in conflict with allowing logs to be in storage one metre from emerging vegetation. Most log storage areas are following the second provision but are not complying with the first requirement.

*Industrial and Urban Development*
(no discussion of indicators)

*Recreation*
- The merit of counting the number of recreational boats moored up and down the river as a measurement of recreational progress was questioned.
- What is the recreational carrying capacity of the estuary? How does that get addressed?
- Measuring discharges from recreational boats should be added as an indicator.
- Existing measurement indicators do not address the protection of wildlife corridors. Habitat protection needs to be monitored separately from recreation; in fact the two are frequently in conflict. Some areas need to be left alone and safeguarded for non-human uses.
3.6 Evaluation of Workshops

At the end of each workshop, an evaluation form was handed out to participants to fill out. They were given the option of handing in, faxing, mailing or not completing the evaluation form. Only at the Port Coquitlam meeting did a majority of those attending return completed evaluation forms. A total of 13 completed evaluation forms were received. A copy of the evaluation form and all comments made are included in the Appendix.

An analysis of the evaluation forms indicates that a majority felt that the information provided at the workshop was informative and that the workshop objectives were clear. There was a strong feeling that the workshop format focused on small group discussion allowed those attending to raise their issues and ideas. Although this question received the most positive response, it also had the lowest response rate likely because the evaluation form question commented on break out groups, which in fact did not occur.

Eighteen positive comments were received about the workshop. Most of these comments related to the workshop format, its educational value and receptiveness of facilitators and staff to comments made. Fourteen comments were made on how the workshop could be improved. A wide range of topics were covered several commenting on a desire for more time or a faster paced meeting, the low attendance and more participation from FREMP partners. The final section on the evaluation form allowed open ended comments - fourteen were made with very little overlap in content.

A more detailed analysis of the evaluation forms is included in the Appendix including the mean scores to all quantitative questions and all qualitative comments.
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 The role of FREMP and its basic thrust received broad support among participants. Whether their perspective was from marine industry or environmental organizations, those who attended the workshops indicated that FREMP does in fact provide valued services. There is, however, a need to refine some of the goals and principles. The action programs need review as well. Some targets have been largely achieved, others have proven difficult to measure and there is a need to identify new action programs.

4.2 The indicators outlined in the report, Monitoring The Estuary Management Plan are currently not contained in the EMP. If these indicators are to be included in an updated EMP, they need to be more clearly linked to the goals, Action Programs and tasks. Different indicators may need to be generated in order to more explicitly measure progress in meeting the goals.

4.3 The relationship between the vision, goals, principles, action programs and monitoring indicators needs to be addressed. The hierarchy is not well understood and some compression may be warranted in the interests of clarity and simplicity.

4.4 The role of public consultation in the project approval process needs to be reviewed by the partners. Environmental and community groups have advocated an enhanced and more formalized role for public involvement in an updated EMP. FREMP would presumably require additional resources in order to implement such an objective. A closely related request was for a renewed commitment by FREMP towards public awareness and education.

4.5 Phases III and IV should concentrate on updating and fine-tuning the EMP. There are various ways in which this could occur. FREMP partners need to decide on the role and content of the updated EMP. For example, is the EMP meant to be a comprehensive compilation of existing inventory information such as the 1994 version, which included detailed actions that the partners were expected to carry out in support of the EMP goals and principles? Alternatively, is the EMP meant to be more of a strategic planning/policy document that sets out FREMP's future direction, objectives and activities over the next 5-10 years? The role of the indicators needs to be clarified as well. Are the indicators measuring the environmental and economic health of the estuary or the accomplishments of the EMP?

One option would be for a comprehensive updating of the 1994 EMP including all background documentation and inventories. Another option would be for a more limited update with a focus on fine-tuning the vision, goals, principles, and Action
Programs. Either option should allow for discussion around key issues and future needs.

Regardless of which option is chosen, it is suggested that the public involvement process will be more productive in Phases III or IV if proposed changes to the EMP are identified. This would enable the public to react to specific proposals, which may include alternate approaches. The alternative of starting with a blank slate and asking for public input is not recommended.

In terms of timing, it may be more productive for some advance preparation to be undertaken by the Water and Land Use Committee of FREMP in the fall of 2002 and defer any major public event until the spring of 2003. This could involve a workshop with the Water and Land Use Committee to discuss the purpose of the EMP and a framework for suggested changes. The next public event might include a workshop with invited representatives of community groups to discuss proposed changes. A broader public event, such as a meeting and/or open house could be conducted to receive broader input on an updated plan. Including an event designed to generate a higher level of public involvement than occurred in Phase II would be desirable provided the focus is not lost. This could include a joint event with FREMP partnering with the Fraser Basin Council or the GVRD.
The meeting opened at 7:15 p.m. with a welcome and introduction from Joe Stott, Program Manager of FREMP. He provided a background to the process and introduced Anna Mathewson, Water and Land Coordinator for FREMP and the facilitators Graham Farstad and Mike McPhee. Anna Mathewson gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Estuary Management Program (EMP) and why it needs to be updated. Anna Mathewson, Joe Stott and Graham Farstad then responded to questions and answers concerning the process, objectives and timelines for the EMP update. No FREMP partners were in attendance although one planner from the City of Vancouver was present. Total attendance excluding staff and consultants was 8.

**Question and Answer Period**

Q. Could you explain what you mean by consultations with partners and stakeholders and what type of public event you will be having in the fall?

A. We intend to meet with our partner organizations over the next several months, hopefully on a one-on-one basis. We also intend to meet with First Nation organizations and various stakeholders and interested groups, like the Fraser River Coalition. We are planning a regional consultation event this fall, perhaps around the GVRD's Green Zone event.

Q. How was this event advertised?

A. Notices of the workshops were mailed out to FREMP’s 300 name mailing list. Ads were placed in local papers such as the Vancouver Courier and local Richmond papers, including as part of the city’s Environment Week publications.

Comment: Advertising in just the local papers isn't good enough; you need to put ads in the major newspapers - Sun and Province. You need to prepare a Press Release and send it to both the papers and radio. I hope there will be more opportunities for public input.

Q. How will the FREMP EMP fit in with the GVRD's Sustainability Initiative? I have a concern that there may not be sufficient communication or co-ordination between FREMP and the GVRD on this. I'd like to see a representative from GVRD at these workshops.
A. The GVRD is a FREMP partner and chairs the FREMP Water and Land Use Committee, so there should be close communication. FREMP's EMP update process and the GVRD's sustainability initiative are complementary.

Q. The FREMP EMP Monitoring Report documents progress on several indicators. Will there be sufficient government resources to continue this type of monitoring and will the cost of the public consultation process result in reduced resources for monitoring?

A. One object of the consultation process is to determine the most appropriate indicators for monitoring purposes. FREMP wants to ensure the most effective use of its resources. FREMP itself does not undertake monitoring; it relies on other agencies and organizations. The public consultation process has been planned for some time and is not connected to the cost of monitoring progress toward EMP goals and objectives.

Following the initial part of the meeting, the group reconvened around several tables at the back of the large meeting room. A small group discussion of the EMP vision, goals and principles was facilitated by Graham Farstad and documented by Mike McPhee on a series of flip charts.

**EMP Vision, Goals and Principles**

**Vision**

*To improve environmental quality in the Fraser River Estuary while providing economic development opportunities and sustaining the quality of life in and around the estuary.*

Comments

- The vision needs to be placed in context in terms of its relationship to the coast, Province of B.C., Pacific Ocean as well as Canada and the continent.
- The vision also needs to add a dynamic element in order to address and manage change.
- Quality of life should include both human and natural elements.
- First Nations are not mentioned in the vision and should be included somewhere in the EMP.
Goals

4. Conserve and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary to sustain healthy fish, wildlife, plants and people.
5. Respect and further the estuary’s role as the social, cultural, recreational and economic heart of the region.
6. Encourage human activities and economic development that protect and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary.

Are these Goals still appropriate? Do they require any revisions or additions?

Comments
- The river is an entity in itself.
- Changes are always occurring; the river is ever changing.
- We must be cognisant of the monitoring results (there is very little public awareness at present) and how we are managing change.
- Change “Encourage human activities and economic development that protect and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary.” to “Work to protect and enhance the environmental and water quality in the estuary in spite of human activities and economic development.”
- FREMP should be more proactive/positive in communicating its goals in order to protect the river.
- Increase co-operation and communication among the FREMP partners to achieve these goals.
- Add references to air and water.
- Think in terms of outcomes.

Principles

Conserve and enhance the estuary.
1. Keep the estuary healthy.
2. Conserve and sustain the natural habitat.

Integrated management
3. Encourage multiple uses within the estuary.
4. Promote integrated decision making.
5. Establish and maintain informed management processes.


*Fairness, Equity and Accountability*

6. Promote and employ consensus-based decision making.
7. Provide equitable access to the estuary.
8. Establish and maintain accountable management processes.
9. Develop active partnerships with the public in management activities.

Do these principles need any modifications?

Comments
- Provide more public involvement and participation in management.
- Provide and publicize an annual/biannual review of the Plan.
- Undertake audits and updates of goals and outcomes.
- Prepare a possible report card (like the Fraser Basin Council).
- The current EMP says nothing about sustainability.
- “Multiple uses” poses an issue. There needs to be some designation for specific uses.

*Action Programs*

The following six action areas are key targets in the current Estuary Management Plan that support the vision, goals and principles on the previous page.

   *Key measurement indicators: Toxic contaminants and fecal coliform levels*

Comments
- A focus on prevention and source control is needed.
- Fecal coliform is cheap to measure but has limited applicability.
- E. Coli should be added as an indicator.
- FRAP water quality report had some good recommendations and indicators. This work should be continued and the indicators monitored.
- What is the interrelationship with other agencies that are also doing monitoring?
- New contaminants (for example, those that mimic estrogen) should be monitored.
2. **Fish and Wildlife Habitat:** ensuring that the remaining habitat is maintained and that new habitat is allowed to develop

*Key Measurement Indicators: Productive fish and wildlife habitat, winter count of water birds and health of resident fish.*

**Comments**
- The current emphasis in the indicators is on quantity and is confined to a very small number of species. What about other resources (e.g. salmon and sturgeon)?
- Why aren’t we measuring age, class and health as well as numbers?
- Look at the environment in a broader perspective.
- The phrase “plants and animals” is restrictive.
- There is a need to protect and maintain biodiversity.
- Need to protect ecosystem processes and functions.
- Remove the word “remaining”. The target should be to improve the natural habitat, as what is remaining is too little.

3. **Navigation and Dredging:** maintaining a balance between shipping and habitat needs in terms of sediment removal from the estuary.

*Key Measurement Indicators: Sustainable sediment removal; dredging.

**Comments**
- The indicator should be reworded (sediment removal at a sustainable level).
- Is the removal of sediment really at sustainable levels?
- Pont Grey dumpsite to be addressed by FREMP. Ocean dumping is not acceptable there.
- A Dredge Material Plan needs to be developed and implemented.
- There is a need to get a handle on the “smaller” dredging activities (e.g. MacDonald Beach).
- Put a limit on the size of ships that can use the channel. Excessive dredging may occur in order to maintain minimum shipping channel depths. These requirements may not be environmentally sound.
4. **Log Management**: minimize the impact of log storage and handling while ensuring that the forestry industry can store and handle logs in the Fraser River. 
*Key Measurement Indicators*: compliance with log storage guidelines, wood debris volume.

Comments
- Include finer or smaller wood debris through storm sewers etc. as well.
- Look at other targets.

5. **Industrial and Urban Development**: ensuring sustainable human activities on a living, working river.
*Key Measurement Indicators*: proportion of regional, marine cargo shipments in estuary, amount of land available for water dependant industry, employment in water dependant industries.

Comments
- A better definition of sustainability is needed.
- Ensure that shoreline sustainability is built into urban development.
- The aesthetics of the shoreline and viewscapes needs to be addressed (i.e. broken concrete rip-rap).
- There should be encouragement and recognition of green urban / industrial development.

6. **Recreation**: ensuring the water’s edge is an attractive place for people who want to relax, exercise, enjoy nature, and learn more about the region’s history or economic importance.
*Key Measurement Indicators*: Visits to regional parks along the estuary, length of recreational corridors, number of recreational boats moored in the estuary.

Comments
- Having the number of recreational boats moored up and down the river as a measurement of recreational progress was questioned.
- What is the recreational carrying capacity of the estuary? How does that get addressed?
- These objectives are competing with other objectives.
- We should include learning about the river itself.
• Look at access issues such as conflicts with other uses (e.g. industry) and environmental impacts. There is too much concentration on people, not what is best for the river.

The meeting concluded at 9:45 p.m. Graham Farstad distributed an evaluation form and invited participants to fax or mail it in if they felt short of time. He also noted there were three upcoming workshops in other communities and invited participants to pass the word along. The worksheets could also be sent in with written comments. The following persons attended the workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leah Merrell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evelyn Feller</td>
<td>Fraser River Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Edwin Caravir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emma Jarata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. June Binkert</td>
<td>Fraser River Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. V.G. Brink</td>
<td>Fraser River Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Judy Williams</td>
<td>Fraser River Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Brian Riera</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting opened at 7:10 p.m. with a welcome and introduction from Joe Stott, Program Manager of FREMP. He provided a background to the process and introduced Anna Mathewson, Water and Land Coordinator for FREMP and the facilitators Graham Farstad and Mike McPhee. Anna gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Estuary Management Program (EMP) and the reasons why it needs to be updated.

Graham Farstad asked if there were any questions concerning the process, objectives and timelines for the EMP update. As there were no questions, the facilitators focused on the EMP vision, goals and principles. A 10-page Workbook was then distributed to those in attendance. The Workbook was expanded from the one used at the initial workshop in order to more fully describe the Plan’s six action programs, the original targets within these action programs, the current status of these targets, and indicators used in monitoring progress. The expanded Workbook also provided more opportunities for written responses.

As the original enclosed atrium setting proved noisy in the rain, the small group discussion of the EMP vision, goals and principles reconvened in a quieter room around several tables. It was facilitated by Graham Farstad and documented by Mike McPhee on a series of flip charts. No FREMP partners were in attendance although three Port Coquitlam councillors were present. Total attendance at the meeting excluding staff and consultants was 12.

EMP Vision, Goals and Principles

Vision

*To improve environmental quality in the Fraser River Estuary while providing economic development opportunities and sustaining the quality of life in and around the estuary.*

Is this vision still valid today?

Comments/Questions

- Is the vision something to be achieved over time?
• The concept of ecosystem health needs to be incorporated.
• FREMP will only work if it is given legal status to propose legislation at the provincial and federal levels needed to improve environmental standards.
• Recognize that FREMP is not in control of all the factors to improve environmental quality in its area of jurisdiction. Many negative factors (i.e. chemicals and debris) come from up river.

Goals

1. Conserve and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary to sustain healthy fish, wildlife, plants and people.
2. Respect and further the estuary’s role as the social, cultural, recreational and economic heart of the region.
3. Encourage human activities and economic development that protect and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary.

Are these Goals still appropriate? Do they require any revisions or additions?

Comments
• Identify overlapping jurisdictions and who impacts whom.
• Clarify the scope of what FREMP is doing and who is involved including the role of the GVRD.
• Bring in the concept of healthy ecosystems.
• To 3rd goal add at the end, “...and minimize impact from developments.” or reword as “Minimize human activities and economic development that harm the environmental quality of the estuary”.
• It is difficult to achieve the 3rd goal.
• Climate change needs to be addressed (i.e. the impact of sea level rise, increasing frequency/intensity of storms and storm water flows).
• Waterways need to be maintained (i.e. channel depth) to sustain waterfront commerce. The role of commerce is essential yet its health is often overlooked. Goals do not give adequate reference to the economic side, which may reflect priorities when the original Plan was developed.
• Moving more goods by water will help reduce impacts from roads and contribute to air quality improvements.
• Need to improve, not just sustain fish / wildlife, etc.
• FREMP needs to build partnerships with other groups, etc.
• More economic emphasis is needed. Recognize this is a living, working river.
• Some economic activities will not enhance the environment. As a result, some mitigation measures will have to be accepted.
• If nation states have no legal status to suggest improved environmental standards worldwide, environmental groups will have very little impact on worldwide environmental problems. If environmentally minded people aren’t willing to discuss solutions to environmental problems at the international level with lawyers who can make a difference with these patterns, it will be all for naught.

Principles

Conserve and enhance the estuary.
1. Keep the estuary healthy.
2. Conserve and sustain the natural habitat.

Integrated management
3. Encourage multiple uses within the estuary.
4. Promote integrated decision making.
5. Establish and maintain informed management processes.

Fairness, Equity and Accountability
6. Promote and employ consensus – based decision making.
7. Provide equitable access to the estuary.
8. Establish and maintain accountable management processes.
9. Develop active partnerships with the public in management activities.

Do these principles need any modifications?

Conserve and enhance the estuary.
  1. Keep the estuary healthy.
  2. Conserve and sustain the natural habitat.

Comments
• Improve the health of the estuary. The existing principle implies that the estuary is already healthy. We must recognize that the estuary needs improving.
• Deal with pollutants in a timely manner – not over 50-75 years, and develop new programs to deal with ‘new’ pollutants such as hormone mimics.
• FREMP should work with GVRD land use policy as a guide.
• FREMP should encourage provincial and federal governments to keep funding environmentally minded people who actually improve river habitat for all living things, especially fish.
• Prioritize issues and identify which ones FREMP can / should address.
• Move towards better standards or performance-based management approach for regular or routine maintenance projects (level 1 projects). The existing process is still too complex and time consuming. The Ports are too cautious in dealing with routine low impact projects. Perhaps a checklist of requirement should be developed to simplify approval procedures.

Integrated management
3. Encourage multiple uses within the estuary.
4. Promote integrated decision making.
5. Establish and maintain informed management processes.

Comments
• The risk of integrated decision making is a monoculture of poor decision making.

Fairness, Equity and Accountability
6. Promote and employ consensus – based decision making.
7. Provide equitable access to the estuary.
8. Establish and maintain accountable management processes.
9. Develop active partnerships with the public in management activities.

Comments
• The previous provincial government used consensus decision making for many environmental issues. The current government is ignoring most consensus decision making.
• Do not gentrify the waterfront.
• Public education is very important.
• Creating partnerships could be a goal in itself but it needs to be effective.
• There needs to be better engagement with public, not just consultation. (Favourable comments were made about the current workshop process and the November 27,
2001 Public Forum at the Fraser River Discovery Centre in comparison to other consultative processes.)

- There should be more publicity about FREMP activities. People can relate to the scope of FREMP.
- Public education needs to be strengthened.
- Industrial access to water is needed. Equitable access does not mean public access to every part of the waterfront.
- Be more precise about equitable access as it is not achievable in all areas all the time.
- A balance is needed between public access/parks and commercial and private land.
- There is a need for channel dredging above New Westminster. The current situation is inequitable to some marine commerce. A process is needed to help waterborne transportation/commerce including channel maintenance above the Patullo Bridge.
- There is channel maintenance needed up river by PNC (Langley Island).
- There should be less regulation in some areas along the river (i.e., for regular maintenance activities).
- Outside the FREMP area, log storage/water lot regulation is looser. This is inequitable to those who are subject to FREMP guidelines and the two ports.

**Action Programs**
The following six action areas are key targets in the current Estuary Management Plan that support the previously stated vision, goals and principles.

1. **Water Quality Management**: developing an integrated approach to environmental quality management and environmental quality monitoring.
   *Key measurement indicators: Toxic contaminants and fecal coliform levels*

   **Comments/Questions**
   - What golf course maintenance standards exist regarding environmental impact and how do they fit into the picture?
   - Move towards sediment quality guidelines.
   - More emphasis is needed on non-point sources of pollution (i.e. storm run-off and two stroke engines).
• Water quality indicators need to be reviewed. The use of Great Blue Heron eggs may not reflect estuary conditions. Why not look more at benthic organisms?

• Water quality should be a central role. FREMP partners should use their mandates to protect water quality.

• The monitoring of toxic contaminants needs to be broadened. Look at hormone mimics, for example.

• There was some questioning as to whether the status targets has been met (i.e. target for sewage).

• Many water quality items are beyond FREMP’s control (i.e. sewage treatment).

• On going monitoring is required but many water quality contaminants are coming to the estuary from up river (i.e. other jurisdictions).

2. Fish and Wildlife Habitat: ensuring that the remaining habitat is maintained and that new habitat is allowed to develop
   Key Measurement Indicators: Productive fish and wildlife habitat, winter count of water birds and health of resident fish.

   Comments
   • No new Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) have been created since 1994. (This was in response to the Workbook comment that four new WMAs had been created in addressing the original target of securing legal protection for habitat areas with high ecological significance.)

   • More details are needed on the size of WMAs (i.e. their size, location, etc.).

   • Measurement indicators should focus on wildlife that are more confined to the estuary. Wildlife that rely on the upland for food are less appropriate indicators.

   • The state of new productive habitat must continue to be monitored.

   • Great blue heron populations should be monitored as indicators.

   • Gulls eat garbage. This is not an indicator of ecosystem health, only of landfill abundance. What about monitoring other birds such as ospreys or purple martins?

   • Commit to protect Douglas Island for wildlife and fish, not for public recreation.

3. Navigation and Dredging: maintaining a balance between shipping and habitat needs in terms of sediment removal from the estuary.
   Key Measurement Indicators: Sustainable sediment removal; dredging.
Comments/Questions

- Flood protection/safety should be added. Dredging for flood protection is required. If sediment removal is neglected, this will affect the risk from flooding (i.e. 200 year Flood Construction Levels are based on the flood capacity of the river. The margin of safety gradually decreases over time without sediment removal).
- What is being released from the sediment when dredging takes place?
- Navigational requirements are not being addressed above the Patullo Bridge. This includes dredging for channel maintenance, docks and facilities.
- There is a need to dredge some secondary channels, not just the main channel.
- This objective of balanced sediment removal may not be achieved in all areas.
- Remove the word ‘shipping’ and replace it with ‘commerce’ or ‘navigational’ as these are more apt descriptions.

4. **Log Management**: minimize the impact of log storage and handling while ensuring that the forestry industry can store and handle logs in the Fraser River.
   
   *Key Measurement Indicators:* compliance with log storage guidelines, volume of wood debris.

   Comments
   - Collect and recycle cables and banding.
   - Prevent log storage in areas where booms ground out at low tide.
   - The requirement for no grounding of logs is in conflict with allowing logs to be in storage one metre from emerging vegetation. Most log storage areas are following the second provision but are not complying with the first requirement.
   - There is no regional debris management strategy.
   - The FREMP area needs a debris collection and removal site and process to utilize wood and other wastes to process energy.

5. **Industrial and Urban Development**: ensuring sustainable human activities on a living, working river.
Key Measurement Indicators: proportion of regional, marine cargo shipments in estuary, amount of land available for water dependant industry, employment in water dependant industries.

Comments
- The municipal development process needs to be tied into the FREMP mandate.
- The protection of properties requires land access for water oriented commercial and industrial uses including commercial fishing.

6. Recreation: ensuring the water’s edge is an attractive place for people who want to relax, exercise, enjoy nature, and learn more about the region’s history or economic importance.

Key Measurement Indicators: Visits to regional parks along the estuary, length of recreational corridors, number of recreational boats moored in the estuary.

Comments
- Measuring discharges from recreational boats should be added as an indicator.
- Get jet boats under control or ban them.
- Eliminate two stroke engines and protect water quality.
- Partnership support from FREMP should guide and encourage municipalities and partnership groups to develop a signage and interpretive program.
- Protect sensitive habitats from expanding marinas.
- Leave Douglas Island alone.

The meeting concluded at 9:25 p.m. An evaluation form was distributed and participants were invited to complete it and leave it at the meeting, fax or mail it in. (Eight were subsequently received.) Graham Farstad and Joe Stott thanked participants for attending and noted the two upcoming workshops in other communities and invited participants to pass the word along. The Workbooks could also be sent in with written comments.
The following persons attended the workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Allen Jensen</td>
<td>City of Port Coquitlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sean Blackman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pamela Zevit</td>
<td>Como Lake Watershed Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Victoria Otton</td>
<td>Burke Mountain Naturalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Elaine Golds</td>
<td>Burke Mountain Naturalists / Pitt River Area Watershed Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mike Bowen</td>
<td>Councillor, City of Port Coquitlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Arlene Crowe</td>
<td>Councillor, City of Port Coquitlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sherry Carroll</td>
<td>Coquitlam River Watershed Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bob Crocker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mike Forrest</td>
<td>Councillor, City of Port Coquitlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. John Bowles</td>
<td>CMC / Harken Towing Co. Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ted Wingrove</td>
<td>Hyde Creek Watershed Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FREMP Public Workshop #3
Bear Creek Park Pavilion, Surrey
July 3, 2002

The meeting opened at 7:15 p.m. with a welcome and introduction from Joe Stott, Program Manager of FREMP. He provided a background to the process and introduced Anna Mathewson, Water and Land Coordinator for FREMP and the facilitator Mike McPhee. Participants introduced themselves. Anna Mathewson gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Estuary Management Program (EMP) and why it needs to be updated. Several FREMP partners were in attendance including representatives from the Management Committee (BC Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection), Water and Land Use Committee (City of Richmond and GVRD) and the Environmental Review Committee (Fisheries and Oceans Canada). Gary MacKinnon, the FREMP Economic Development Coordinator and two members of the public (Delta residents) were also in attendance.

Following the presentation by Anna, Mike McPhee facilitated a group discussion involving all the participants. A Workbook that includes the Vision, Goals, Principles and Action Programs of the Estuary Management Plan was handed out to all participants and provided a focus for the discussion. Discussion points were recorded on flip charts by Mike McPhee and are presented below.

Key Issues and Concerns

The two public workshop participants were asked if there were any issues or concerns from their perspective that they would like to raise.

Comments

• Concern over how the farm community is handling (stewarding) the land, especially the spreading of manure on fields and the potential for runoff into the Fraser River.
• There is likely a lack of compliance with, and enforcement of the provincial guidelines on the amount and timing of manure spreading.
• This issue is outside the FREMP boundaries (i.e., upland of the dykes); however, it was recognized as an important non-point water quality issue that should be addressed by FREMP.
EMP Vision, Goals and Principles

There was no discussion on the EMP Vision, Goals and Principles but participants were asked to forward any comments they might have to the FREMP office.

One of the participants directed several questions to the FREMP partners: "Is progress being made toward achieving these goals, say over the past five years? Are there any critical issues or problems? Are the partners able to enforce regulations?"

Comments
• FREMP has published a report - Monitoring the Estuary Management Plan, which is a report on the performance of FREMP and its partners. (Note: copies of this report were handed out to participants)
• The report noted that progress is being made but improvements are needed in some areas.

Action Programs
The following six action areas are key targets in the current Estuary Management Plan that support the vision, goals and principles on the previous page.

1. Water Quality Management: developing an integrated approach to environmental quality management and environmental quality monitoring.
   Key measurement indicators: Toxic contaminants and fecal coliform levels

Comments
• Target (c) is not being fully met (i.e., agricultural runoff).
• Non-point sources of pollution need to be addressed in the FREMP area; original Plan focused primarily on point-source pollution but there is also recognition that sources of pollution include non-point sources such as agricultural run-off and contaminated sites. We need to recognize that activities inside the dyke affect the areas outside the dike, for example run-off can end up impacting downstream
• Trend data for indicators is important to monitor water quality over time.
• Original task of preparing a coordinated emergency response plan was not needed since responsibility rested with provincial and federal agencies.

2. Fish and Wildlife Habitat: Ensuring that the remaining habitat is maintained and that new habitat is allowed to develop.
   Key Measurement Indicators: Productive fish and wildlife habitat, winter count of water birds and health of resident fish.
Comments
• Perhaps focus more on the "productivity" of habitat as an indicator, not just the areal extent of habitat (e.g., more may not necessarily be better)
• Look at increasing the productivity of existing habitat areas
• Securing legal protection of habitat areas has been carried out by other agencies as well (e.g., federal, provincial, municipal, regional and NGO’s). There needs to be co-ordination between FREMP and municipalities so that areas of high priority can be identified and different levels of government can work co-operatively to protect them.
• Other tools for conserving habitat should be explored (e.g., conservation covenants).
• Need to tie this Action Program into an overall biodiversity strategy as being piloted by the GVRD's Biodiversity Initiative pilot, which addresses the functionality of areas.
• Need to link upland biodiversity and ecosystem functions and processes with the river corridor and estuary. We need to recognize upland contributions to the health of the estuary, and look at how FREMP and upland jurisdictions can further coordinate their respective management roles.

3. Navigation and Dredging: maintaining a balance between shipping and habitat needs in terms of sediment removal from the estuary.
   Key Measurement Indicators: Sustainable sediment removal; dredging.

   Comments
• Need an overall dredging plan that addresses operational dredging issues (e.g., marina operations) as well as for shipping.
• Examine rationale for dredging, beyond navigation (i.e., flood protection).
• To manage the sediment budget, FREMP should examine extending the boundary beyond Kanaka Creek to include the sand reach (Kanaka Creek to Mission). Or even if FREMP does not extend its boundaries, it should consider expanding the sediment budget management area from Kanaka Creek to Hope.

4. Log Management: minimize the impact of log storage and handling while ensuring that the forestry industry can store and handle logs in the Fraser River.
   Key Measurement Indicators: compliance with log storage guidelines, wood debris volume.
Comments
- FREMP could work with educational institutions to find alternative uses/markets for wood debris.
- Log storage guidelines are being met; however, need to monitor to ensure compliance continues.
- Lack of log storage may actually impact negatively on the shoreline because of boat wash eroding the shoreline, including marsh areas.
- FREMP should continue to work with other agencies to find a funding solution for maintaining the Agassiz debris trap.
- Need a wood debris management plan for FREMP area (in addition to log management guidelines). Debris management may be a new action program. Debris coming from outside the FREMP area impacts on the estuary.
- Long term log storage strategy not likely a high priority in the short term.

5. **Industrial and Urban Development**: ensuring sustainable human activities on a living, working river.
   
   Key Measurement Indicators: proportion of regional, marine cargo shipments in estuary, amount of land available for water dependant industry, employment in water dependant industries.

Comments
- FREMP working group is examining the movement of goods within the region by barge in order to reduce truck traffic (and associated impacts such as air quality and road congestion).
- FREMP still looking at the nodal industrial concept for the estuary.
- Viewscapes have not really been integrated with well in the EMP. Primarily a municipal concern. Could potentially be tied in with area designation process.
- Potential to do an inventory of viewscapes along the river corridor and tie in with a cultural resources inventory. However, not considered a high priority.
- Don’t drop viewscapes task completely, as we still want to achieve these.

6. **Recreation**: ensuring the water’s edge is an attractive place for people who want to relax, exercise, enjoy nature, and learn more about the region’s history or economic importance.

   Key Measurement Indicators: Visits to regional parks along the estuary, length of recreational corridors, number of recreational boats moored in the estuary.

---

**UPDATING THE FRASER RIVER ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**PHASE II – COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS**

**ARLINGTON GROUP PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURE INC.**
Comments

- Recreation use needs to be coordinated with fish and wildlife habitat management to ensure that there is compatibility between uses. Need to recognize that we can’t have recreation everywhere, all the time – this reinforces the importance of ecosystem planning.
- FREMP should look at ecotourism potential and plan it to ensure it is compatible with conservation values of the estuary. Guidelines or a plan for the emerging ecotourism industry on the river might be helpful tools.
- Debris management and dredging issues should also be part of the recreation action program (i.e., benefits to recreation users of debris management and dredging operations at marinas). Need an integration of issues; there are links between dredging, recreation, conservation, agriculture etc.
- FREMP needs to revisit its mandate with regard to public awareness and education of the estuary. It should consider coordinating an educational program linking to all the Plan components and to stewardship. Fraser River Discovery Centre is also an educational resource.

The meeting concluded at 9:00 p.m. Mike McPhee distributed an evaluation form and invited participants to fax or mail it in if they felt short of time. He also encouraged them to send in their completed worksheets. The following persons attended the workshop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brian Naito</td>
<td>Fisheries and Oceans Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Susan Haid</td>
<td>GVRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brian Clark</td>
<td>Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gary MacKinnon</td>
<td>BIEAP-FREMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Don Cameron</td>
<td>Resident, Delta (Westham Island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gail Cameron</td>
<td>Resident, Delta (Westham Island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. David Brownlee</td>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting opened at 2:30 p.m. in the small theatre with a welcome and introduction from Joe Stott, Program Manager of FREMP. He provided a background to the process and introduced Anna Mathewson, Water and Land Coordinator for FREMP and the facilitators Graham Farstad and Mike McPhee. Anna Mathewson gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Estuary Management Program (EMP) and why it needs to be updated. Graham Farstad facilitated the balance of the meeting starting with questions and answers concerning the process, objectives and timelines for the EMP update. One FREMP partner from the GVRD, Susan Haid from the Water and Land Use Committee, was in attendance. Gary MacKinnon, the FREMP Economic Development Coordinator and Steven Scheving, Planner from the City of New Westminster, also attended. Total attendance excluding staff and consultants was 8.

**Question and Answer Period**

Q. How were the workshops advertised?

A. They were advertised in the local community newspapers, in Business in Vancouver, and notices were placed in libraries and community centres. FREMP also mailed out 300 notices and contacted groups via phone and email to let them know about the workshops.

Q. Why not advertise in the major daily newspapers? You need to get the word out to a broader audience.

A. These two papers were shut down for several weeks due to a labour dispute. There was extensive notification sent out using a variety of approaches. The facilitator noted that although workshop attendance had been limited, those who had attended provided thoughtful and valuable comments. With workshops containing representation from marine industries, environmental and community groups, municipalities and FREMP partners, this would enable a good scoping of issues for later phases of the FREMP update.

Comment (Joe Stott, FREMP): If you've got ideas for getting people out for future events, we'd like to hear them. Also, we've had representatives from many of the groups that have an interest in the estuary.
Following the initial part of the meeting, the group reconvened to another meeting room more suitable for a round table discussion. The small group discussion of the EMP vision, goals and principles was facilitated by Graham Farstad and documented by Mike McPhee on a series of flip charts.

**EMP Vision, Goals and Principles**

**Vision**

*To improve environmental quality in the Fraser River Estuary while providing economic development opportunities and sustaining the quality of life in and around the estuary.*

Is this vision still valid today?

Comments/Questions

- There were no objections to the vision statement although a repeated comment was made that before discussing the vision, we need to know if the monitoring report established whether or not the current objectives of the Estuary Management Plan had been met.

**Goals**

1. *Conserve and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary to sustain healthy fish, wildlife, plants and people.*
2. *Respect and further the estuary’s role as the social, cultural, recreational and economic heart of the region.*
3. *Encourage human activities and economic development that protect and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary.*

Are these Goals still appropriate? Do they require any revisions or additions?

Comments

- What kind of human activities and economic development can protect and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary? The meaning of the third goal is not clear.
- A clear idea and model of sustainability is needed. The “three-legged stool” concept (i.e. environment, economy and society/social relations) is ridiculous because without the environment, you have nothing.
- Environmental protection is the key indicator of environmental sustainability.
• Christmas bird counts are not scientific. (Reference to Action Program #2 and indicators selected as part of the monitoring report.)

• FREMP needs to implement a daily “open door” approach to consultation as opposed to a more bureaucratic process. Also a comment was made that original FREMP public education component has fallen away over the years, so there may be less awareness of FREMP.

• Coordinated project review has changed; it is now led by the Port Authorities. The heart of coordinated project review has been lost.

• We need a place where people can ask questions.

• A greater public awareness and education focus from FREMP is needed.

• Does public want more input and participation in activities? – Implementation.

• There is a problem with Goal 3, which is meant to focus on mitigating or minimizing impacts. However, there may be opportunities to improve or enhance environmental quality. Some human activities can have positive impacts.

Principles

Conservative and enhance the estuary.

10. Keep the estuary healthy.

11. Conserve and sustain the natural habitat.

Integrated management

12. Encourage multiple uses within the estuary.
13. Promote integrated decision making.
14. Establish and maintain informed management processes.

Fairness, Equity and Accountability

15. Promote and employ consensus – based decision making.
16. Provide equitable access to the estuary.
17. Establish and maintain accountable management processes.
18. Develop active partnerships with the public in management activities.

Do these principles need any modifications?

Comments

• It is difficult to determine connection between vision, goals and principles. Are the principles expected to be implemented? – (Response: Yes).

• Meant to be guiding principles to achieve goals.
• There seems to be very few (only 2) principles related to environmental protection. These principles are reactive; more proactive principles are needed. For example, biodiversity should be included.

• A very proactive statement for protecting the estuary is needed.

• There should be a tie into ecological functions and processes. Ideas have evolved from “pollution prevention” to now, ecosystem functioning.

• What role should the public have in integrated management of the estuary?

• Earlier public notification on project proposals is needed. By the time information becomes available, it is often too late for public involvement to have any effect.

• An example of the need for public notification was cited concerning dolphin/piling replacement in Delta. This was handled by Fraser Port as a Track 1 project and was not referred to the ERC. In reality, the application was far more than the replacement of worn out dolphins; it represented a major expansion of marine infrastructure.

• Two suggestions were made to make information more accessible to the public. One was for sent a letter of notification to the Mayor and Council concerning new project applications. The other was to post Track 1 projects on the FREMP web page.

• A way is needed for FREMP to receive local community input. But communication goes both ways, and community groups and individuals should make FREMP aware of their availability to participate in activities.

• FREMP should look at establishing an Environmental Advisory Committee similar to those established by municipalities. If FREMP refers projects to mayors and councils, this information would, as a matter of course, be circulated to municipal Environmental Advisory Committees. This will enable informed input “earlier in the game” so that the interested public will know what is going on.

• There is a need for better monitoring and follow up on projects (repairs, etc.) A specific example is the construction of log booms to protect the foreshore from debris.

• How can accountability be followed up?

• Can development cost charges be imposed for development taking place in the estuary? (Answer: yes, if used for drainage or park land purposes.)
**Action Programs**
The following six action areas are key targets in the current Estuary Management Plan that support the previously stated vision, goals and principles.

1. **Water Quality Management**: developing an integrated approach to environmental quality management and environmental quality monitoring.  
   **Key measurement indicators**: Toxic contaminants and fecal coliform levels  
   **Comments/Questions**  
   • Need to address intensive forms of farming such as nutrient management & runoff into the estuary. B.C. is not meeting international standards and this is a problem for the whole estuary.  
   • In reference to Target (a), there is a need to determine if new programs are necessary to measure toxic contaminants. Many of the existing contaminants were approved more than 30 years ago when approval standards were lower and new contaminants need to be monitored. A positive comment was made concerning the presentation by Ken Hall at the November 27, 2001 public forum on monitoring the FREMP Estuary Management Plan. Dr. Hall presented ideas on cumulative effects assessment for future consideration by FREMP and mentioned new kinds of contaminants that may not be picked up under existing regulations.

2. **Fish and Wildlife Habitat**: ensuring that the remaining habitat is maintained and that new habitat is allowed to develop  
   **Key Measurement Indicators**: Productive fish and wildlife habitat, winter count of water birds and health of resident fish.  
   **Comments**  
   • How will the Fish Protection Act regulations apply concerning riparian setbacks along the Fraser River? It was noted that three and one half years remain before implementation of these regulations is required. A comment was also made that FREMP had engaged partners around how setbacks would apply within the estuary, but now the regulations are in limbo.  
   • What types of projects does FREMP follow up on and monitor?  

3. **Navigation and Dredging**: maintaining a balance between shipping and habitat needs in terms of sediment removal from the estuary.  
   **Key Measurement Indicators**: Sustainable sediment removal; dredging.
Comments/Questions

• What is happening with prop wash dredging at marinas? This is a problem in Ladner but is not being addressed. A coordinated approach from the ports is needed leading to guidelines concerning this practice.

• How are proposals for dredging maintenance outside the navigation channel handled? (Response: they come through the lead agency to FREMP).

4. Log Management: minimize the impact of log storage and handling while ensuring that the forestry industry can store and handle logs in the Fraser River.
Key Measurement Indicators: compliance with log storage guidelines, volume of wood debris.

Comments

• What is the future of the debris trap at Agassiz? (There was agreement on the need for long term funding for this needed facility. A conflict between economical and environmentally friendly means of debris disposal was noted.)

5. Industrial and Urban Development: ensuring sustainable human activities on a living, working river.
Key Measurement Indicators: proportion of regional, marine cargo shipments in estuary, amount of land available for water dependant industry, employment in water dependant industries.

Comments

• There is a need for flood protection to be addressed as the protection of people and property may conflict with riparian values. A new action program around flood protection and dyking may be needed including co-ordination with the regional engineers advisory committee of GVRD.

• Viewscapes haven’t been fully addressed by FREMP. There is a need to consider keeping this in revised Estuary Management Plan but recognize that it is also a recreation issue.

6. Recreation: ensuring the water’s edge is an attractive place for people who want to relax, exercise, enjoy nature, and learn more about the region’s history or economic importance.
Key Measurement Indicators: Visits to regional parks along the estuary, length of recreational corridors, number of recreational boats moored in the estuary.
Comments

- Are the Green Zone and greenways concepts compatible? Are we losing Green Zone values to recreation use? In some cases, the public wants to use these areas.
- The ecological side of the Green Zone strategy needs work. Bio-diversity needs to be included in Green Zone management.
- Reference was made to compensation money for airport (YVR) expansion on Sea Island, and the fact that habitat compensation funds should be used for their intended purpose. These funds were intended to be applied to the purchase of and enhancement of old field habitat sites to replace lost old field habitat due to airport expansion.
- Existing measurement indicators do not address the protection of wildlife corridors. Habitat protection needs to be monitored separately from recreation; in fact the two are frequently in conflict. Some areas need to be left alone and safeguarded for non-human uses.

The meeting concluded at 4:45 p.m. An evaluation sheet was distributed and participants were invited to complete it and leave it at the meeting, fax or mail it in. (Three were received.) Graham Farstad thanked the participants for attending.

The following persons attended the workshop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gary McKinnon</td>
<td>BIEAP-FREMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jim Stephen</td>
<td>Doman Group/Western Forest Products Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stephen Scheving</td>
<td>City of New Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Susan Haid</td>
<td>GVRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clay Brown</td>
<td>Coast Forest &amp; Lumber Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mary Taitt</td>
<td>Boundary Bay Conservation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Susan Jones</td>
<td>Boundary Bay Conservation Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION FORMS

All questions on the evaluation form are shown in italics as follows:

1. *Which workshop did you attend?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. *The information provided at the beginning of the workshop on the background to the updating of the Estuary Management Program was:*
   Respondents were given a five point numeric scale ranging from *Not informative at all* (1) to *Very informative* (5).
   The average (i.e. mean response) was 3.69 with individual responses ranging from 1 to 5. There were 13 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (n=1)</th>
<th>2 (1)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th><strong>3.69</strong></th>
<th>4(4)</th>
<th>5 (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not informative at all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.69</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. *The objectives of the workshop were:*
   Respondents were given a five point numeric scale ranging from *Not clear at all* (1) to *Very clear* (5).
   The average (i.e. mean response) was 3.69 with individual responses ranging from 2 to 5. There were 13 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (0)</th>
<th>2 (1)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th><strong>3.69</strong></th>
<th>4(6)</th>
<th>5 (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not clear at all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.69</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. *The break out groups allowed me an opportunity to raise my issues and ideas.* Respondents were given a five point numeric scale ranging from *Strongly disagree (1)* to *Strongly agree (5).*

The average (i.e. mean response) was 4.12 with individual responses ranging from 3 to 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were only 8 responses to this question. Nearly half did not reply to this question. The low response rate is likely due to the fact that there were no smaller break out groups as attendance levels did not warrant more than one discussion group at each workshop.

5. *Overall, I would give this workshop a:* Respondents were given a five point numeric scale ranging from *One star rating (1)* to *A five star rating (5).*

The average (i.e. mean response) was 3.61 with individual responses ranging from 2 to 5. There were 13 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(One star)</td>
<td><em>(Five stars)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. *What did you like about this workshop?*
   - Informality
   - Input welcome
   - Open to ideas/comments
   - Small crowds allowed good discussion
   - Information
   - The educational handouts
   - Informative
   - Small group had opportunity for better communication
   - Set-up and location worked well
   - Facilitators and FREMP representatives were well involved
   - Small group format - everyone has a chance to speak
   - Good staff
   - Good organizations

---
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- Opportunity to discuss a number of issues
- Very good discussion
- Everyone had an opportunity to express ideas and opinions
- Facilitators were earnest in responses to questions
- Nice combination of a well organized, structured meeting that was conducive to open discussion

7. What things could be improved about the workshop?
- Time needed vs. time allocated
- Better advertising; more advance notice - don’t hold it in June/July – we are tired of going to meetings
- More time
- The focus should be exactly on what all the stakeholders in the immediate area are doing about environmental problems in the Fraser River area
- Move the meeting along quicker so as to touch on more subjects
- Idea of what materials would be available for review be prepared (i.e. what is on web site)
- Perhaps e-mail out workshop materials or make available for download for those who pre-register
- Move it along quicker – it dragged out a bit
- Too much time dominated by a few people
- Less noisy location. Lots more public notification e.g. Vancouver and Province
- Representation from all the 6 partners
- Would like to have heard from port authorities
- More discussion re: Project Review Process
- Attendance seemed weak but given the fairly strong publicity efforts you did, it could indicate that people are happy and contented with FREMP’s work

8. Other Comments
- Extend FREMP interest to Hope and Yale.
- Examine shoreline and adjacent water recognizing riverine energy places
  a) for public access, groyne establishment and sand beach creation if not present
  b) a la Laura Remple’s study on the gravel reach, identify special habitats on
    shore and river, habitats for plants, animals and other features.
- Restore FREMP involvement in education re the river and shores and the place of
  the Fraser in the larger environment.
- Relate to national and provincial monitors of economy and environment
- Good work!
- Thank you!
- More informative representatives present such as GVRD, Hydro, etc., boat
  owners, fishermen, recreational users
It appears turnout could have been better, or there are often same people at these events. Need to get more varied attendance from business, political, municipal staff and local NGOs. Many do not recognize the importance of their involvement or input.

Concerned about zealous environmentalists having undue influence on process

We need balance not polarity.

Sustainability is also about social and economic needs, not just environment.

There needs to be much better monitoring and evaluation of the next EMP update.

A much wider discussion of habitat and wildlife indicators since 1994 is needed before the new plan is drafted.
FREMP developed the Estuary Management Plan in 1994 with the idea that it would be a living document. We need to update the Estuary Management Plan to reflect changes since that time and the progress made on the action programs.

We think the vision, goals and principles of the Plan still provide solid guidance for the management of the estuary, but these need to be confirmed. New action programs may be needed, and new targets established under each action program. Some of the existing targets and tasks may need to be continued.

We are just beginning our public consultations, starting with a series of four workshops in communities around the estuary. This will be followed in the fall of 2002 by a regional event to identify and prioritize initial input on the updated Plan. With a drafting and review period set for the winter and spring of 2003, we intend to complete the updated Plan by fall 2003.

This workbook is intended as a complement to the community workshops.

You can use this as a guide in the small-group discussions. You can also take this workbook home to fill in other points you would like to raise and fax or mail back to FREMP.
EMP Vision, Goals and Principles

Vision  Is this vision still valid today?

To improve environmental quality in the Fraser River estuary while providing economic development opportunities and sustaining the quality of life in and around the estuary.

Goals  Are these goals still appropriate?  Do they require any revisions or additions?

- Conserve and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary to sustain healthy fish, wildlife, plants and people.
- Respect and further the estuary’s role as the social, cultural, recreational and economic heart of the region.
- Encourage human activities and economic development that protect and enhance the environmental quality of the estuary.

__________

__________

__________

1 As adopted in 1994
Principles     Do these principles need any modifications?

Conserve and Enhance the Estuary
1. Keep the estuary healthy
2. Conserve and sustain natural habitat

Integrated Management
3. Encourage multiple uses within the estuary
4. Promote integrated decision making
5. Establish and maintain informed management processes

Fairness, Equity and Accountability
6. Promote and employ consensus-based decision making
7. Provide equitable access to the estuary
8. Establish and maintain accountable management processes
9. Develop active partnerships with the public in management activities
Action Programs

The following six action programs contain key targets and tasks that support the Plan's vision and goals. The indicators help measure our progress in meeting these targets.

Questions for Discussion:

Action Programs
- Do you feel these action programs will advance sustainability in the estuary?
- Are other specific action programs required?
- Have any important issues been missed?

Targets
- What targets or tasks should continue?
- Should new targets or tasks be added?

Indicators
- Are other indicators needed to measure progress on these targets?
**ACTION PROGRAM #1 - Water Quality Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Articulate an integrated approach to water quality management in the estuary by 1995.</td>
<td>Target met through FREMP Partner initiatives to control discharges and implement pollution abatement measures, including GVRD's Liquid Waste Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Take appropriate actions to improve water quality in the estuary.</td>
<td>Target met through FREMP Partner initiatives to control discharges and implement pollution abatement measures, including GVRD's Liquid Waste Management Plan, Environment Canada's best management practices for marinas, and a nutrient management plan for farm run-off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Prepare and implement a Co-ordinated Environmental Emergency Response Plan by 1995.</td>
<td>Target was not required (responsibility rests with appropriate agencies).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Indicators used: Toxic contaminants; fecal coliform levels; remediation of contaminated lands)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
## ACTION PROGRAM #2 - Fish and Wildlife Habitat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Maintain and improve, where possible, the existing habitat base to support viable and productive populations of fish, wildlife and plants.</td>
<td>Net gain of 92,332 m² of productive habitat from compensation and enhancement projects in the FREMP area. FREMP and its partners require developers to maintain existing habitat or compensate for any negative impacts on habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Monitor habitat losses and gains.</td>
<td>FREMP continues ongoing monitoring of habitat gains and losses in its Habitat Project Database (based on information from Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada). FREMP Environmental Review Committee (ERC) selects projects for follow-up evaluation and monitoring of habitat and other design issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Secure legal protection for habitat areas with high ecological significance.</td>
<td>Four new Wildlife Management Areas created. Securing private lands with high ecological values has been undertaken at the municipal level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Indicators used: Productive fish and wildlife habitat; winter count of water birds; health of resident fish)
### ACTION PROGRAM #3 - Navigation and Dredging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop and maintain a functional navigation system that supports water-dependent development and protects both environmental quality and existing utility corridors.</td>
<td>Dredging done in accordance with the “sediment budget” – the amount of sediment, calculated annually, that can be sustainably removed from the river. Net deposition of sediment over past 5 years. Dredging Guidelines developed in 2001, reflecting a consensus among regulatory agencies around a general approach to dredging in the estuary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Manage the removal of sediment from the estuary in a manner that balances shipping and habitat needs.</td>
<td>(Indicators used: Sustainable sediment removal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Indicators used: Sustainable sediment removal)
## ACTION PROGRAM # 4 - Log Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reduce the generation of waterborne debris resulting from log handling in</td>
<td>Best Management Practices for wood debris management have been developed and need to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the estuary by eliminating or mitigating those activities that produce debris.</td>
<td>FREMP participates in the Debris Management Group for operation of the Agassiz debris trap and development/implementation of a regional debris management strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. All log storage to be in conformity with the Log Storage Guidelines by 1996.</td>
<td>All lots are in full compliance with FREMP Log Storage Guidelines. Ongoing monitoring required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Confirm the long-term continuation of specific log storage areas and address</td>
<td>Area Designation process used to designate and protect existing and potential log storage areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future tenure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Inform and educate the public about log storage and handling in the estuary.</td>
<td>Target dealt to some degree under recreation action program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Indicators used: compliance with log-storage guidelines; volume of wood debris)
## ACTION PROGRAM #5 - Industrial and Urban Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Direct development to areas in the estuary where conflicts with habitat protection and incompatible uses are minimized.</td>
<td>Area Designation process reconciles foreshore and upland activities. Six Area Designation agreements completed. Two are currently underway. FREMP’s Coordinated Project Review process provides environmental reviews of projects in the estuary. FREMP’s habitat classification maps and in-house GIS are available to assist decision-makers. FREMP habitat inventory and classification system improvements under development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Protect the land and water area required to satisfy the demand for water-dependent industrial use for the foreseeable future.</td>
<td>Target largely achieved through area designations. Nodal development strategy outstanding; FREMP Economic Development Task Group is exploring intermodal transportation strategy for the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. By 1995, determine the viewscapes to be maintained from land and water.</td>
<td>Viewscapes dealt with through the GVRD’s Green Zone strategy and in municipal planning processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Indicators used proportion of regional, marine cargo shipments in estuary; amount of land available for water dependent industry; employment in water dependent industries)
# ACTION PROGRAM # 6 - Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Complete the Fraser River Estuary Management Plan by securing key elements within outstanding Units and developing Linear units between the Recreation units where possible.</td>
<td>Significant progress made on these targets through GVRD Parks and municipal parks programs and the Lower Mainland Nature Legacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Implement an estuary-wide signage program and an interpretive plan by 2000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Indicators used: Visits to regional parks along the estuary; length of recreational corridors; number of recreational boats moored in the estuary)

Please take the time to complete this workbook.

You can submit it to:

**Fraser River Estuary Management Program**

#501 – 5945 Kathleen Avenue  
Burnaby, BC  V5H 4J7  
Fax 604-775-5198  
Phone 604-775-5756
Fraser River Estuary Management Program
Updating the Estuary Management Program Workshop
Workshop Evaluation

1. Which workshop did you attend? Richmond ______
   Port Coquitlam ______
   Surrey ______
   New Westminster ______

2. The information provided at the beginning of the workshop on the background to the updating of the Estuary Management Program was:
   1  2  3  4  5
   Not informative at all Very Informative

3. The objectives of the workshop were:
   1  2  3  4  5
   Not clear at all Very clear

4. The break out groups allowed me an opportunity to raise and discuss my issues and ideas.
   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly disagree Strongly Agree

5. Overall, I would give this workshop a:
   1  2  3  4  5
   One star rating A five star rating

6. What did you like about this workshop?
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________

7. What things could be improved about the workshop?
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________

Other Comments:
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your comments!
Please drop this form off at the sign-in desk before you leave or mail or fax to Fraser River Estuary Management Program (FREMP)
#501 –5945 Kathleen Avenue
Burnaby, BC V5H 4J7 Fax 604-775-5198