

AGENDA

FORUM ON CONSERVATION AND HARVEST PLANNING FOR FRASER SALMON May 7th, 8th and 9th, 2013

Purpose: Annual DFO and First Nations fishery management planning process for Fraser Salmon.

Meeting Objectives:

- To provide a response to previous letters sent to DFO on behalf of the Forum participants.
- To provide an overview of feedback to date on the 2013-14 South Coast Integrated Fisheries Management Plan (IFMP)
- To continue discussion on sockeye escapement options.
- To have discussion on Chinook fishing plans for FSC.
- To receive an update from the Fraser Watershed Joint Technical Working Group.
- First Nations only session.

Agenda:

May 7th, 2013 – DAY 1

Tier One and Two

1:00 Introductions and response to feedback from the March Forum (facilitator and Les Jantz)

2:00 Overview of feedback on draft 1 of the IFMP received to date by DFO and opportunity for clarification (DFO reps from BC Interior, Lower Fraser and South Coast)

2:45 Health Break

3:00 Fraser Sockeye escapement options and implications (Les Jantz, Jennifer Nener)

- Sharing Options
- Cyclic stocks
- Late run exploitation rates

4:30 End of Day

May 8th, 2013 – DAY 2

Tier One and Two

8:30 Welcome, Opening Prayer, Recap of Day 1, Introductions

8:45 Update from the JTWG (Pete Nicklin, Jamie Scroggie)

9:30 Chinook FSC Fishing Plans (DFO Staff): Development of a FN plan for Zone 1

10:00 Health Break

10:15 Catch Monitoring Working Group updates (Tatiana Lee)

11:15 Southern BC Coho Management (Les Jantz)

12:00 Lunch Provided

1:00 First Nation only to discuss information provided and develop recommendations for DFO

4:00 End of Day

May 9th, 2013 – DAY 3

Tier One

9:00 First Nations continue to develop recommendations for DFO

10:30 Health Break

10:45 Continue

12:00 End of Day

ATTENDEES:

Sonora Morin	IMAWG	smorin.imawg@gmail.com
Wesley Sam	Burns Lake Nation	Wesley-sam@hotmail.com
Cynthia Brean	DFO-RM-Lillooet	Cynthia.brean@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
George Napoleon	Titqet Council	georgen@titqet.org
Doreen Copeland	Titqet	
Bernette Laliberte	Cowichan Tribes	bernette.laliberte@cowichantribes.com
Dominic Hope	YFN	dominic@yalefirstnation.ca
Debra Sneddon	DFO	
Linda Stevens	DFO	linda.stevens@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Tracy Wimbush	Nicola Tribal Association	tracy.wimbush@nicolatribal.org
Bea Paton	Takla Lake First Nations	jacoventures@gmail.com
Janice Billy	SGS	jbilly@statimc.net
Valerie Diablo	Xaxlip	valieriediablo@xaxlip.ca
Kevin Whitney	T'itnet	kevin-1959@hotmail.com
Sidney Douglas	Cheam	
Murray Ned	LFFA and STC	
Gord Sterritt	NSTC/FRAFS	
Ken Malloway	FRAFS/LFFA	kenmalloway@shaw.ca
Tom Nevin	DFO	tom.nevin@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Greg Wadhams	IMAWG	numas.gw@gmail.com
Carl Frederick	Lherdli Tenneh	cfrederick@lherdli.ca
Irvine Johnson	Esk'etemc	ijohnson@esketemc.ca
Aaron Gillespie	SFC	agillespie@shuswapnation.org
William Rabang	Skway	wra.bang@hotmail.com
Miranda Brooke	SFC	mbrooke@shuswapnation.org
Tina Donald	Simpcw-Sntc Rep	tina.donald@simpcw.com
Mike Staley	FRAFS	mstaley@mstaley.com
Tatiana Lee	DFO	Tatiana.lee@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Dave Levy	Statimc Govt Services	davidlevy@shaw.ca
Dean Allen	DFO-BCI	dean.allen@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Greg Thomas	DFO	greg.thomas@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Adrian Wall	DFO	Adrian.wall@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Les Jantz	DFO	les.jantz@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Jamie Scroggie	DFO	Jamie.scroggie@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Merv Mochizuki	DFO	
Brian Matts	DFO	
William Barney		
Monte Bromley	DFO	monte.bromley@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Becky Spreng	High Bar First Nation	hbfnooffice@netbistro.com
Lita Gomez	DFO	lita.gomez@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Barry Bennett	TIB-Kamloops	bbennett@kib.ca
Alyson Mchugh	Coldstream Ecology	Alyson@coldstreamecology.com
Nick Soverel	Coldstream Ecology	nick@coldstreamecology.com
Kelsey Campbell	A-Tlegay	kelseycampbell@shawcable.com
Tony Roberts Jr.	A-Tlegay	tonyrobertsjr@hotmail.com
Brian Wadhams	Namgis/IMAWG	
Rupert Wilson	Kwakiutl/IMAWG	rupertwilson@gmail.com
Lee Spahan	Coldwater Indian Band	
Kim Charlie	Sts'ailes	kim.charlie@estsailles.com
Sally Hope	Seabird Island	sallyh@seabirdisland.ca
Pete Nicklin	FRAFS/UFFCA	pnicklin@telus.net
Gilles Verret	DFO-LFA	gilles.verret@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Katie Beach	IMAWG	ktbeach@gmail.com
Terry Teegee	CSTC	tteegee@cstc.bc.ca
Pete Erickson	Nakaznli	tsohdih@hotmail.com
William Rabong	Shzwhay	wra.bang@hotmail.com
Fred Sampson	NTA	fredmsampson@gmail.com
Margo French	TLFN	sumthlotz@gmail.com
Greg Thomas	DFO	greg.thomas@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Adrian Wall	DFO	Adrian.wall@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

NOTES:

***DFO:** Fisheries and Oceans Canada

***FN:** First Nations

***FRAFS:** Fraser River Aboriginal Fisheries Secretariat

DAY ONE

Introductions and Response to feedback from March Forum (Facilitator and Les Jantz)

- Welcome and prayer.
- Facilitator reviewed the agenda and purpose of the fourth meeting for Forum.
- Reviewed ground rules: listen, have fun, be on time, actively listen, confidentiality, turn off phones, respect interests and opinions, help recorder, speak for yourself, ELMO rule (enough, lets move on).
- Information to found at a later date: FRAFS website house all the presentations from the Forum meetings. www.frafs.ca, then tab to Forum.
- Tour of Seaton Conservation Project; sign up sheet for 6:30 tomorrow night.
- First Nation gathering (unity riders) arriving Thursday in the afternoon.
- Good turn out today; question regarding the need of the Forum, and it suggest that this is a worthwhile purpose. DFO thanks for the effort to coming to Lillooet and to First Nation community.
- IFMP (Draft Two) will touch base on a lot of the issues that we will review tomorrow. Try to cover off all the issues covered off in the IFMP with all species.
- Talk a lot about Chinook; try not to have that dominate the conversations. Spending some time to discuss Chinook and touched on in the IFMP discussion.

Response to last Forum Letter

- Majority of the issues focuses on Chinook issues and some sockeye.
- Copy printed out.
- Frustration to DFO responses to issues brought forth, Spring and Summer 4/2 and 5/2.
- DFO hasn't been accepting the suggestions from Forum.
- Significant management actions have been done that impacts the stocks.
- DFO 2010 developed a restrictive S 4/2 management approach, including a strategic planning process. Trying to compile all the information on all Chinook stocks; DFO is relying on this process to deal with Chinook.
- Approach DFO is taking: 2010/2011 showed reduction of impacts.
- Reduced exploitation rates, do not have results from 2012.
- Depending on where those land, may be looking at modifications, but will continue what is in the IFMP.
- Non-native harvest available and FN don't have access statement: DFO said that there are restrictions in the fishery, information on what is harvested in the marine area. Closures for the recreational river closed to retention. Mouth of Nicola is closed entirely.
- Marine fisheries are opportunities on mixed stocks; the 1-2% harvested is S 4/2.
- Approach S 4/2; continue as planned. S & S 5/2 going to review impacts and how to manage them.
- February Forum recommendations; question to management actions in S 4/2; need to see data. Data was attached to March and May meeting response letters. Tables show particulars to support management approaches.

- FN: provide data for Spring and Summer 5/2? DFO: yes.
- **ACTION:** DFO to provide data for S&S 5/2.
- Question: non-native harvest more than FN; is this true? DFO: yes, that is likely more Chinook harvested for all stocks between sport and commercial fisheries.
- FN: marine fisheries catch data are needed to ease the mind of the communities. Need to know DFO plan for 5/2 for fishing opportunities. Very frustrated that sport fishing happens in the marine area, but river communities are still limited.
- DFO: Data for S&S 4/2 5/2 Chinook; DFO uses Code Wire Tagging (CWT) are the fall back position on it. DNA is not that available. Provide CWT data on a regular basis. 2012 data has not been provided as the key science person is on another assignments. To be able to be fish again; DFO is willing to discuss different approaches on how to make fishing more opportunities. Such as specific closures to get in/through the river, and/or opening for harvest. Want to make sure that we don't go into the exploitation rate as want to encourage the incline to happen.
- FN: when can FN fish on the river? There are so many fisheries in the marine, it limits return. Need to cut them back to see if stocks increase.
- DFO: marine sport fisheries have restrictions in the Juan De Fuca and Strait of Georgia; these are areas that could target Fraser Stocks. If there are improvements, it is hoped that stocks will rebuild and limitations can be decreased. If fishing is wanted early, can look into.
- FN: same conversation as we had two years ago. Sport fishery catches more than FN is disturbing, especially when FN have not targeted Chinook for the upper nations. Suggested, need more constraints on the sports fishery such as limiting down riggers. How do we get the right information we need to see which stock is where, and FN can be that tool to collect that information to get that data. DFO won't allow FN to help get that information. Have marine, river and DFO work together to get the proper information to have DFO manage these stocks. Monitoring and compliance is setting up increased creel surveys to help; get true numbers.
- DFO: Tatiana will speak to catch monitoring tomorrow morning. DFO has been clear, we know there are data gaps, need a strategic review/process to get all the data around Chinook (habitat, catch, returns) and how is the best way to move forward. There will be science review with recommendations on where to focus and how to rebuild. We don't have all the data to make those decisions. DFO is willing to look at restrictions on sports fishing, and have made adjustments.
- Comment: what do we do within the next five years when the study is supposed to happen? Can't we do something now to avoid any more damage? Funding could run out.
- DFO: need to wait until the science review.
- FN: a lot of Chinook caught in March and April; where do those fish come from going to? Non-native harvest year round, and FN are limited: FN didn't say that sports are catching all the time, but data from the JTWG do show significant numbers, including stocks that FN are trying to conserve. If FN needs aren't being meet, Sparrow indicates that others need to be limited to cease infringement on rights. There is talk about going to court to force DFO to limit sports fishing on conservation stocks. Victoria fishing show was showing many Chinook being caught and thrown back to catch bigger size fish. These catch and release fish are damaged and some die. This puts too much stress on the fish. Having a size limit causes stress; it's easier for just a two limit. Sports fishers can move to openings, they are mobile if an area is shut down. Need to get as much fish as we can on the fishing grounds. Sparrow is not serving us well.
- DFO: if there is data showing that conservation stocks being impacted, they will make changes. Greg Thomas: coverage is the most extensive in Victoria; creek starts very early in the season. FN is right, we don't cover all areas all the time, just high risk areas to make the best use of resources. Looking at a better systems to monitoring that Tatiana will touch on. This will help a broader view on catch effort. PICFI contributed program.

- FN: FN are heavily monitored to catch FSC, food taken away, people taken to courts, but yet the sports fishery is hardly touched. Joint management isn't clear. All Chinook are suffering along the coast, there are no solutions on how to fix it besides coming to the table. FN are continued to be bullied; so there is a question if DFO and FN are really working together.
- DFO: there are a number of things that Forum has made that have been incorporated to improve management. For an example Zone breakpoints needed to be changed and they were. Listed a number of others accepted, but also hasn't accepted others. DFO can't predict everything, rely heavily on season information; and will continue to use that to plan management. Starting to see some improvement.
- FN: response; yes we want to see those tools to work for us. Hopefully we won't be repeating ourselves next year.
- Facilitator: talking common interest of data collection and monitoring. When are those (beside the Chinook Framework) timings going to happen? FN want to take on roles to help.
- DFO: fishing plan in the lower Fraser; moving effort to earlier in the year. Management tool with LLFA; could allow to go in earlier, and to maintain low expectation rate. Have not received that plan yet, and need to develop that. Continued to have those discussions with Tier One.
- FN: do we recommend things, but may not incorporate. Need to restate into clearer direction on FN recommendations. There is a recommendation for FN to assist on catch monitoring. Restriction on sports equipment recommendation. Sports fishers are forced to fish in one area; like to have a one area recommendation forced/implemented. DFO statement of the future; when is that? Page 13 or 209, monitoring document needs to be consulted with FN. Same page: FSC monitoring improvements; who is working on this? FN are heavily monitoring. Zone management references: closures; does this include FN? This leaves one week of fishing.
- DFO: comments/recommendations; if the group feels that it's important enough, that FRAFS write a letter to DFO to provide them. Recreational data is through voluntary program to make improvements.
- **ACTION:** FN to state a recommendation for letter to DFO while making comments in the meeting. This to be clarified with recorder.
- FN: data takes a year or so to get this data.
- DFO: yes it is not timely, but it does take a year. CWT is voluntary. Changes are being made to make this non-voluntary when approached by a creel surveyor. Normally comes out in April; but this year it didn't to a number of reasons.
- FN: Impact of sports fishing; need to know how many licence target Chinook. Marine FN aren't getting their fish; this isn't right. Why is that? DFO needs to show more restrictions to sport fishers for those stocks. 1-2% is a lot of fish when there is no fish to be had. Can we change stocks to conservation concerns? DFO won't change sports fishery as it's part of the economy.
- DFO: Management of salmon is DFO. Yes, there is a lot of money made of that industry group. Closures in river to protect 4/2 and 5/2; hear from the community that there are funding loss. Huge regulation changes to deal with conservation issue directed at the sports fishery. Short window for commercial fisheries. Lower Fraser closure in place came as a recommendation from Forum.
- FN: Ernie Cray met with sport reps from Vancouver Island. Gerry Christianson talked for a couple of hours. Nothing concrete came out of it, but just introductory. Some basic over arching issues.
- FN: Conservation and priority; those are two types of fisheries. They are not equal as on is a right and other is a privilege. Conservation might mean two different things to DFO and FN. Need to be more clear on the planning stages and admit the limitations and address real concerns. Priority; Sparrow isn't clear to DFO and what it means. FN needs to sit down and address that.
- DFO: never said that the two were equal. It is really clear on priority. Conservation issues and management approach as been a struggle for years; concerned about shutting everything down to

total limit of no FSC fish. DFO has approached management by stock via window closures. Trying to keep exploitation rates down to a minimum percent. Direct fisheries on abundant stocks for FSC. This in theory would help rebuild stocks.

- Facilitator: proposes collaboration.
- DFO: address IFMP questions; monitoring document is finalized March 2012 but is going through a panel, including FNFC and others. This was provided for consultation. Next steps discussion tomorrow.
- FN: need to have sports industry process for discussion without DFO to create dialogue. This might help make progress for change to bring back to DFO. Get DFO to fund a process to have dialogue with them. Not getting anywhere with DFO within the last five years. Need to have sports industry so that we can deal directly with major concerns.
- DFO: all groups have the same interests in mind. We used to have FN in the IHPC process (sport and commercial); a DFO/FN would be encouraged. The Chinook strategy could be an avenue.
- DFO: early Stuart Sockeye; ultimatum not giving. Two options provided in the IFMP are what we sticking two. FN can provide other options, and would like to see them via a letter recommendation.
- DFO: Fraser River management plan for lower abundant stocks is being developed. PSC pre-season planning model, adjusted in the Fraser Panel process. Escapement plan for early summers; allowable TAC would be in the 13-15% and will most likely change when the panel meets. Escapement will adjust the exploitation.
- FN: recommendation for sockeye hasn't happened as sockeye wasn't discussed.
- DFO: yes, Anne-Marie Huang did provide sockeye updates and suggested management measure.
- Facilitator: Tier One hasn't talked about sockeye; and FN have been focusing on Chinook. This is up to FN to bring forth more recommendations for sockeye. DFO is putting the ball back in FN court on sockeye.
- DFO: FRISSI process; metrics for options. Bring them forth.

IFMP Draft IFMP

- **Reference presentation: 2013 Draft #2 Salmon IFMP: Issues and Overview.*
- Dean Allen provided the presentation.
- 2nd Draft IFMP sent out to FN via FNFC.
- FN: doesn't agree with the TAM rules (Lheidli t'enneh); option provided in regard for early summers for Bowron.
- FN: isn't there should be another option in regards to fish farms (Cohen recommendations); could be impacted by fish farms. Where and when is DFO going to get serious on looking at impacts of diseases? Coho feed on juvenile sockeye; need to look at that as well. Need to rebuild.
- DFO: farming is separate to escapement plans. Higher TAM rules, would results in lower expectation rate.
- FN: Different Zones; doesn't understand the lack of urgency for stock to survive. DFO has down to 1 fish per person in some areas, but DFO is still talking TAC. 45 fish into the Bowron; when does this become urgent to DFO?
- DFO: we have raised stocks of concern; if collectively Forum would like to recommend different TAM rules, than should provide that. All impacts will be on the FN fisheries.
- FN: As a DFO manager; shouldn't it be stopped completely than lowered as required for FN fisheries. Risk returns, instead of no fishing until know what is actually returning. Have not seen rebuilding; and as a DFO manager there should be urgency instead of catering to sports fishery.
- DFO: there should be no fisheries until fish are on the spawning grounds?
- FN: how else can we manage without that knowledge? Every year FN have to wait for an abundance to fish.

- DFO: If the objective to have zero harvest on Bowron, there would be no allowable fishery on other stocks to meet need. DFO makes decision based on the collective from Forum. There are FSC needs wanted. If Tier One can get consensus on how to move forward; than bring that forward.
- FN: Don't want to turn into a fight over food fish. There are ways to manage fish in a more effective manner. You aren't changing the models; using the same plans. There has to be other options. From DFO, has not seen a change.
- DFO: FRISSI has tried to maximize conservation and allow for harvest. There has been an large amount of work done. Would welcome other suggestions.
- FN: has not seen a different plan.
- DFO: suggest a change; start a zero fishery.
- FN: that means no marine.
- DFO: there are no directed Fraser River fisheries in the marine environment.
- Facilitator: This will be a FSC FN issue to bring forward. DFO has a difficult situation to deal with. Need to talk about protection and consensus during Tier One.
- FN: management actions on FSC should focus on higher abundance returns; need to back up with data.
- DFO: there are other factors to returns. Combination of many river and marine issues.
- FN: Quesnel and Bowron; any more years and no fish will return. Hard to talk conservation and rebuilding when we don't look at other root causes. Habitat has never been addressed. Logging activity that has taken place via mountain pine beetle; this could play a huge part. Never here DFO making a push on forestry to change practices.
- DFO: this is a need for the wild salmon policy (strategy 4). FN should use the policy to move forward.
- FN: how far do FN recommendations go? FN made a recommendation to cease fishing on a stock and DFO came back still with a harvest percent. Management strategy from the bottom end; maybe there should be a total shut down. If that is what has to happen, that is what may have to happen. Looking for the next seven generations; that is the way it has to be. DFO has to take the responsibility to manage effectively, and this includes the approach areas as well not just in river. DFO managers don't talk; don't see the Area Directors, no one from Haida Gwaii or north. FN have a holistic view in all areas. Marine impacts such as farms have an effect; need to take Cohen recommendations seriously.
- DFO: not going to respond to farms. This discussion revolves around if FN have a better option to manage stocks. Will work with FN to consider strong and weaker stocks. Could make decisions from limited timings, etc.
- FN: DFO keeps using the same techniques year after year; and each year it gets worse. Try to put a rolling closure on Chinook this year, and DFO will get thousands of suggestions for change. Prove that you are changing.
- DFO: If FN are the only fishers on stocks and then those fish become extinct, then FN would be blamed for the decline. DFO would say that FN were responsible for those stock and blame FN.
- DFO: DFO isn't putting all the burden on FN. FN are the only harvesters; if collectively FN put forth a plan, DFO will consider this.
- FN: suggest a timeframe on effective collaborate together. What is the solution when our resources are gone.
- FN: what fisheries are requested adjustments?
- DFO: USA has requested and other commercial fisheries. In order to harvest pink to have coho managements adjusted. Including recreational. WCVI Chinook target.
- FN: pending more detail analysis: what is the process? Science branch to look into the different proposals that would impact interior coho.

- FN: 23 permits out right now for salmon fishing; so DFO has to be clear that there could be impacts to salmon right now.
- FN: when is DFO going to provide the information to increase by-catch? Area G wants to increase coho. We need to figure if we don't/do support. What are the modeled impacts for interior Fraser coho? These are all commercial and sports requests.
- DFO: yes, until we get the analysis; will not make the decision.
- FN: Southern panel meetings; can't suggest any increase until better information.
- DFO: forecast was not released till the end of April; considerably above what was above the recovery plan. Questions then came about on small changes with the information provided. What point in time do we make changes?
- FN: DNA; Area G fisheries going after WCVI coho; is that based on timing or DNA. Are FN able to do FSC before other sectors? Guidelines on rebuilding plans; never received a document on anything; interested to seeing this if they are different on recovery plans. Proposal for increase; will discuss during Tier One. Don't agree on increase on fishing as should leave it and any fishing should take place with FN.
- DFO: coho access on WCVI; FN, sports and commercial are constraint. FN have access via terminal and treaty. Sports have access of June 1 of marked coho of two per day. Area G access at September 15th and only marked fish during a Chinook fishery. Number or request in marine areas to more access to other stocks; largely US fish. Forecast for WCVI are "high". Area G request is past interior coho returns. Increased bag limits and boundaries for sports with "modest" impacts on interior coho.
- FN: does not like the statement of "moderate" impact. Statements are just thrown around, it does not provided with data. Interior nations have not had access to coho when there is a moderate impact should not be allowed. This not acceptable.
- FN: change from 3-4% was a one year only thing. What would happen post-season on the impacts and if this continues? Requested in the data background. Work will be happening soon, within one month.
- DFO: have a model to assess impacts; have shared it before.
- FN: DFO looking for proposals put forward; intention to look at FSC that has been cut-back and loosen those restriction? Would that require an official request for the nations?
- DFO: gear type will be assessed.
- FN: assessment should be done and FN should be part of the assessment and ensure FN have first part.
- FN: coho closure boundaries and dates?
- DFO: 2 per day, August and September: change to want 4 per day in June Area 23-27, not including Area 24. No interior coho impacts on the inside. Barkley Sound requesting boundary out to the surfline; that where coho impacts would take place. No decisions to take place; but back to FN to make suggestions.
- FN: Opportunities for marine; not have DFO come to the table to talk to FN. Gone to industry to discuss, but haven't come to FN first. If there are any opportunities for coho, need to offer to FN before anything else. Going to put forth the changes regardless of suggestion from FN. Are you going to come to the marine area FN for opportunities. Worried that money given by DFO is a distraction.
- DFO: Provide to Tier One your suggestions.
- FN: Recommendation that DFO come talk to IMAWG in regards to the coho opportunities.
- DFO: this information is "hot off the press". Does not want to see AAROM funds as a distraction. Need to work with rebuilding plans.
- FN: have not seen rebuilding/recovery plans implemented; want to see it.

- FN: North of Lytton that isn't in the "red"; as there is only one good run there will a lot of pressure. Need to find out how much actually got to Chilko spawning grounds. Let's see how much will actually get there after the fishing pressure will happen.
- FN: Interior coho; proposed increased in exploitation must account for FN. FN are bearing the brunt of conservation; not allowed to fish for coho in the main stem. How will DFO account for that? Greg mentioned the WCVI changes will impact interior coho, that infringes FN rights. This does not obligate consultation.
- DFO: understand need to look at impacts on relaxing restrictions. Consultations has just started on this; and will look forward to hearing back from FN.

DAY TWO

Recap of Day Two

- ELMO important today, there was off topic issues brought up, many upset people, went a bit off topic (intentional), but today will be brought more on topic and people will cut off. All regional issues will be put on the parking lot. There are too many issues to allow free forum.
- Pin points: Zone One issues with chinook; potential coho by-catch to pink access; process creates a division in manage (this place is for in-season management); system needs a complete make-over, but have built it to this point "don't throw the baby out with the bath water"; local vs regional issues.
- Quoted the Terms of Reference on purpose of Forum (pre-season planning).
- DFO: Adrian Wall (planning committee) appreciate Marcel's hard work, this is a very unique for FN and DFO come together for a large area, yes there are problem and frustrations but this a good process, been around for a few years, need to review governance/purpose, managed by an agreement by FRAFS and DFO (re-negotiated another AAROM one year agreement), review TOR at website, holistic, larger approach, want to focus on Chinook 5/2 and sockeye, DFO is not driving this process, appreciate the efforts as there isn't another process like this, don't want to make a lot of changes as this is supposed to change into the Roadmap but need to still get together until that time, will raise the issue on feedback on Forum.
- FN: need to ensure that Forum is operating properly, need to say the issues and work on them, a lot of challenges out there and they need to be meet and are connected, need to look at the whole picture.
- **ACTION:** Forum to connect IMAWG and DFO for more interface on Island specific related issues.
- Facilitator: need to be a deeper level of interface on the Island between DFO and FN via IMAWG. JTWG FN reps address the First Nations on what the technical issues are; better to have them address the FN participants before DFO comes into the room.
- DFO: that's a good idea.

Update from the Joint Technical Working Group (P. Nicklin and J. Scroggie)

- **Reference JTWG Presentation; update on:*
 - Sockeye (pre-planning)
 - Interior Fraser Coho (IFMP Draft #2)
 - Chinook (Albion in-season updates, Nicola CWT info update, S/S 5/2 Alternative modeling, Marine DNA sampling)
- FN: dominant run for Early Stuarts? Yes, 211,000 run size. There may a small limited amount of harvest depending on environmental conditions. FN: snow pack is low, water low, poachers high, all Nations going to be targeting, so question how many is going to be on the spawning grounds before sharing. Understanding; there are escapement targets at the P50; can talk about that further during Tier One.

- DFO: cyclic stock patterns needs to talk about, keeping in change factors, dominant cycle may not be lined up this historical dominant runs. Look at forcing to dominant runs or manage with the changes. Important discussion to have during Tier One and into the future.
- FN: possible to measure the difference between 20K and 25K? Level that would maintain a level of diversity and based on historical levels. Minimum sub pop of 1000 through the aggregate area. Developed by Minister Anderson and recovery team in 2002-2004 (2006 Report).
- FN: beach seine in the lower Fraser have been laying off these fish for a long time; and the moment they start to re-build seems crazy to bump up the percentage by-catch. Even if it's a by-catch to the Pink fishery.
- DFO: suggest that FN send a message to DFO if they don't/or do support the increase of percentage by-catch of coho in the pink fisheries and Area G troll fishery (retain both unmarked and marked after mid-September), next year is Adams dominant and potential to fish later/longer. Predict a 42,000 return. Need to think about it in a larger/broader picture to provide opportunities for all groups.
- DFO: asked science for advice on increased levels and impacts. DFO will coordinate with the JTWG once that information is received. Discussion later part of the week then will determine how to consult with FN.
- FN: moving from red zone into something into an amber zone, potential increase, there needs to be a lot of discussion. Questions such as wild salmon policy connections, etc., before moving on.
- FN: To get more accurate counts can't we get more hydro-acoustic? Cost is a factor, and H/A doesn't provide a clear picture. Albion has done a pretty good job estimating.
- DFO: Updates are every two weeks.
- FN: Lower Fraser concerns with DFO, bullet reference to other priorities to deal with. FN have fishing plans and are ready to go but no available DFO person to contact or work with. Frustrated to find out there in no opportunity to work with DFO.
- JTWG: Holding pattern right now with Chinook data until mid-June due to DFO staffing not available.
- FN: need to have a map available during Forum meetings to hand out. Need to task FRASFS/Forum to do this.
- FN: Harvest in opportunity on the same line as Early Stuarts, no FSC until FN can put 100,000 pieces in smoke houses are our needs being met. Look at salmon to the life of the communities; data review isn't comparable. Basic needs have not been met over 20 years. Can we merge JTWG data and Sparrow needs to assess the outcomes. Make sure the two runs together and ensure FN needs aren't being met; ensure that FN is part of the whole picture (predator sort of reference). Pete: have done work for the area, and will bring forward results before bringing back to JTWG.
- JTWG: we don't specifically on late runs (TAM rule applies summer run), but can look at TAM rules to apply to late runs. More technical details at the Tier One section.
- FN: can we do the same with Chinook with the S/S 4/5/1&2?
- DFO: they all go to different spawning areas. JTWG: split for life histories and indicators in a similar geographical area.
- JTWG: important to add biological background during these meetings as a reminder of how the animals are managed.

Monitoring and Catch Reporting Update (Tatiana Lee)

- **Reference presentation Pacific Fishery Monitoring and Catch Reporting Update.*
- FN: challenge with monitoring program due to the science component. Monitors see a lot of things happening on the water that could provide gaps. Need to expand to other areas?
- DFO: Workload and capacity is reference to workload and define relevant information required. Look at what we really need.

- FN: JO Thomas certification program for monitoring? DFO: yes. DFO isn't handing out certificates to FN? Want to know more about the program, where it's held and what sectors for? DFO: JO Thomas does not focus on the interior. They are running training sessions.
- Facilitator: current programs are more marine based; in land fisheries are no systems in place. Proposal for this happen.
- DFO: via PICFI where trying to address that gap, specific for commercial fisheries enterprises (CFE).
- FN: Risk assessment for interior is influence by a lack a capacity or funding.
- DFO: Risk for sport and commercial, FSC risk assessment are underway now and are DFO in house. Working on how to engage in an appropriate way. Look at risk to stock, SARA and by-catch and come up with appropriate level of monitoring and then discussions will take place. In general decision are made with a collaborative working groups.
- DFO: national policy on observers (catch monitoring) need to be certified through a service provider. FSC catch monitors are not at that level and not certified at that level. Question is how to get FN certified through this rigorous program. This includes working on commercial fisheries as well for employment opportunities. Working group: first group was a sport group from the Pacific Region working on improvements on catch monitoring 50/50 split DFO/Reps. Looking at "heat maps" fishery impact areas. Commercial working group 50/50 split DFO/Reps; does not include economic fisheries. Both groups were internal DFO groups and then expanded outside industry. FSC is only internal right now (with FNFC and contractor) to review processes and risk, then will go out the areas to ensure DFO has it right. DFO is not at the point where they are looking in depth risk.
- FN: TEK has to be part of the catch monitoring process.
- FN: what is the process for FN to get certified? DFO: have to go through a certified provider. Depending on the fishery; may need the third party status or not. FN: how to train? DFO: Canadian standards can come audit your program and to ensure that it's certifiable. FN: funds? DFO: don't know yet. Facilitator: FN needs to train FN. DFO: there is a fee for audit in the order of 9K.
- FN: little funding for being part of compliance workshops/board. Stop going to meetings until funding was found. After draft report came out; recreational fishery is okay, but got to clamp down on FN. That was jest of the report and was upsetting. Meeting groups went back to the drawing board and work still being done. Creel surveys: most recreational surveys down on lower Fraser on specific landing sites. Eulachon opportunity for 800lbs, DFO didn't let them go, Kwantlen go ahead, 20lbs received from Kwantlen; Kwantlen was monitored heavily by DFO and RCMP. Shrimp trawl are allowed to take 800 tons of by-catch and throw over-board, but yet they heavily monitor FN. Less than 1% of the shrimp trawl is monitoring. FN fishery is 60-70% for FSC and 100% for economic. Assuming FN is high risk. Must have a huge compliance as well; this includes log books, mandatory if only asked. Needs to be more work done as DFO trust sport to voluntary report yet FN are heavily pressured.
- DFO: in reference to the inequity, this is the reason to have this process to understand the gaps, how the process is undertaken, how we are assessing fisheries, where is there too much and too little, where is the missing information, how to get the information where everyone is comfortable with.
- FN: September 2012 start of Tatiana; DFO has already been working on this, how long? National Standards, third party people; slighted on that as catch monitors in the area have 15 years of experience. Now communities need to have someone else tell them how to monitor in their own area; that doesn't sit well, insulting. Potential to get aggressive in the field if people are approached.

- DFO: Believe established that the working groups within the last 1-2 years; expansion to include outside participant. Third party certification; can understand the frustration, but FSC for fisheries need to create a FN based company to do training. Certification process itself was developed the Canadian Standards people; FN generated solution for that would be great, would like to work towards that.
- FN: via PICFI Namgis have a good monitoring program, but there is so much red tape to put people on the water. Commercial sector is over monitored, log book, hail in, hail out with the report; spending a lot of time recording information. Communication breaks between DFO and service providers. Need to know how much by-catch is being wasted in the ocean. Suggest that Tatiana come to do a presentation to IMAWG as this is largely marine based.
- **ACTION:** IMAWG to invite Tatiana to give the Catch Monitoring presentation.
- DFO: important to know what information is being collected and how it's being used; C&P, resource management or science? Be selective not just a big information grab. By-catch and discards is a priority for DFO, looking at using by-catch and best use.
- Facilitator: discuss the pilot project that is going on in Campbell River.
- FN: timeline of the FSC working group. DFO is doing an internal assessment than go to the community to see if they got it right. Other sectors seem to be involved from the start and FN were not.
- DFO: inventory of the current programs and risk assessment is required. FSC working group has only been around since January. Currently working group is only internal with FNFC; this other groups started the same way. Internal work is polling resource managers and looking at the gaps and what to address. It's getting the internal process in place than create a guide with FNFC input on how to engage.
- DFO: agree that there is a huge issue with eulachon by-catch; DFO is trying to work on it. Work with Heather Brekke with SARA DFO as she has been working on the eulachon conservation efforts in regards to conditions and licence. She needs to come to IMAWG to give a presentation.
- FN: need information on all the by-catch on eulachon. DFO: get Barry Ackerman, Tatiana to provide.
- FN: the guardian program was so a great program, and now DFO wants to wipe out those people/program. If FN in the area have the skills to do a job, then FN need to be hired regardless of the training standards.
- FN: mandatory reporting with asked by creel surveys is marine or fresh? DFO: marine only. FN: CWT program is that linked to collect snouts in both marine and fresh? DFO: no just marine.
- FN: are DNA samples taken?
- DFO: only a minor few from a few fisheries but not every year as the cost is extremely high. There is some data review from that. It doesn't give exploitation rate just abundance.
- FN: voluntary vs mandatory in recreational fishery. Commercial sports fishery needs to have mandatory reporting; halibut buy-back is a good example.
- Facilitator: it about accountability and equality in all sectors.
- DFO: agree is good to have all same information. Pilot around e-logs was focused on guides to see how they are working; plan is to expand on that this year.
- FN: how do we verify/justify how many fish is caught?
- DFO: that is a down fall of the e-log program; that is where the audits need to be discussed.
- FN: catch monitors should be allowed to take pictures along with the fisher to submit to DFO.

Early Stuart Sockeye (Mike Staley)

- **See presentation Early Stuart Sockeye, Harvest and Sharing Options.*
- Referenced table created by DFO based on 1996 sharing arrangements that DFO has been using. Using this model by default if no other proposal is brought forward.

- Expectations:
 - Total run P50% 211,000, escapement 108,000, AFE 27,500, Test Fish 4,717, management adjustment 72,400, TAC sharing 22,502, US 3,700, Canadian share 27,500.
- Management adjustments are flow and temperature past mission (die on route).
- Early June Province will provide flow forecast through out the freshet.
- DFO science take flow data and expectation on weather; generate for temperature forecast, and then management adjustments will be changed.
- Snow pack is average compared to last year where above average; for now the current management adjustment may be quite accurate.
- DFO is looking how to share the 27,000 Canadian Share between FN.
- P25 total run: 137,000 share of 10,500; and P75 total run: 331,000 share of 98,802.
- Will be using those Canadian shares on how the two options will be shared based on a JTWG meeting.
- Table reference on the share amount percentages based on their model table.
- Need to manage numbers per aggregate areas (broken in five areas):
 - Carrier Sekani TC
 - Upper Fraser
 - Mid Fraser
 - Lower Fraser
 - Marine 0%
- FN: Marine area: low abundance, would leave them alone, but if there is TAC we would leave it alone. If there is a high abundance on another stock, marine FN would take from that stock. MS: Marine area would get more numbers; going on DFO amounts/management. Early Stuarts go through the southern approach, late runs come through the northern Johnstone straits.
- Option One Upper Fraser <24.5K
 - Carrier-Sekani TC minimum 1,000 going up to 10K
 - Upper 33%
 - Mid 33%
 - Lower 33%
 - Marine 1%
- Option One Upper Fraser >25K
 - Carrier-Sekani TC 25%
 - Upper 23.3%
 - Mid 23.3%
 - Lower 23.3%
 - Marine 5%
- P50 Breakdown for Option One at Canadian share of 27,500 at run size of 211,000
 - Carrier-Sekani TC 10,750
 - Upper 5,485
 - Mid 5,485
 - Lower 5,485
 - Marine 295
- Rationale to respect the first off the top for upper nations then a split down the rest into the Option One percentages as a proposal to DFO.
- FN: what are the aggregate groups? MS: Lower Fraser go to Yale, Mid goes to Whispering Pines, Upper goes to Prince George, than Carrier-Sekani TC.
- FN: window closures; can we shift window closure? Yes, can shift a week over or under early and summer Stuarts. This would a FN issues as only FN would be harvesting.

- FN: Carrier-Sekani TC people; what is your goal for rebuilding? There is a huge decrease of stocks even though there have been limitations on impacts. Shouldn't be looking at fishing Early Stuarts until we know what the rebuilding plan. Willing not to fish these stocks to allow for rebuilding. Fighting over a small amount of fish might not even be worth it.
- FN CSTC: we did have 27 creeks in the area; within those areas it's been heavily logged and asked for habitat rebuilding with forest companies. Forestry will be working with First Nations in trying to work on logging arrangements around salmon creeks. Need to rebuild specific salmon creeks before any considerations of harvest happen. Have an issue with spraying; no progress. Communities down stream have every right to the fish; and don't want to not allow them to fish. Had to relay on Fort Babine to get FSC. Very emotional experience when FN livelihood and culture depends on the salmon. Fight the forestry industry; need help to do that. DFO doesn't come out to the communities and see the streams/damage. Appreciate bands who don't fish their share to allow CSTC fish come through.
- JTWG: information on the call, brief mention at the group, cycle group year average, this has been the dominant year. With the escapement goal is about 1/2 of the year average goal. DFO has proposed 52K or 108K? Really aren't a lot of options to choose from. One option for early and one for lates. Choice of one an option? This year constrained the thinking. Worthwhile to considering the sharing compared to past years. Last year: Early Stuart 180K estimate, escapement 26K actual. Darren's message is to be careful and pre-cautionary. In-season assessment is not what is happening on the spawning grounds. Move window closures a little bit if everything looked okay, a week or so, would give some protection of early and summers.
- FN Marine: group would leave the Early Stuart alone; we are at the table to see what the possible share might be and work together. We can't start mocking one another; and if that happens, marine will take their share.
- FN Lower Fraser: those have more fish might take what we have for granted and not think of those who don't. Willing not to fish Early Stuarts to allow fish to the SKTC people. Voluntary; we would expect other communities to allow it as well. This includes coho.
- FN: the different P levels; do the CSTC numbers includes mortality? MS: you have to add more fish to incorporate into the calculations. Last year on route mortalities were grossly unrated. Only enough money to count dead fish; but FN have identified how many creeks need to be cleaned. Need to get these numbers to actually what is happening. Suggest that nations go in on there own to reclaim their streams/lake and work on the legal perimeters on work with DFO. Numbers need to reflect Sparrow.
- FN: suggest a legal junction on sports fishery with Chinook; talk to legal team.
- FN: Last year Kamloops nations did seek advice with lawyer and there isn't enough grounds for a junction.
- FN: why don't we all agree that we won't fish that early Stuart run; to ensure the people up north. Most likely not fishing early summer run as not fishing to July. Chief's do not accept licences in the Lillooet area from DFO as where and when to fish. Let's just do it: this has been brought up last meeting.
- Facilitator: we accept the spawning escapements and 90% of run protection, no fishing until Stuart and Nechako confluence.
- FN: Exclude spawning escapement, its up to the CSTC people to decide what is food and what is escapement.
- FN: DFO wants a number. Wording needs to be clear.
- FN: if not fished, someone else might fish it or absorbed into US. DFO might allocate to others.
- FN: Agree to protect 90% of Early Stuart up to the spawning grounds, nor does this effect DFO to allocate those numbers anywhere else. Allows the CSTC food fish.
- FN Prince George: agree to protect fish.

- FN: split the share to have 90% to CSTC 0/0/0/0 then CSTC amount.
- FN marine: agree to that.
- FN: can protect the run with a three week window closure.
- MS: 3-week closure would do that. There is a chance that the run size could be bigger; so at one point do we allow fishing? DFO will come back with that. Need to be clear if larger runs materialize; have a plan.
- FN: Letter need to respect that there may be by-catch on other fisheries. Releasing of those fish, during a Chinook fishery.
- FN: 211K break point, shares going to go up river, after that sharing plan happen? If higher amount go back to the Starret plan.
- FN: Lower Fraser doesn't have sharing plan amongst themselves; need to be aware of that.
- FN: Starret model, and the 0/0/0/0/CSTC plan, but stuck on a rebuilding plan. What is the goal number? Need a rebuilding plan for the stock. Have the plan be all zeros until it gets to a certain point. As the run rebuilds; doesn't mean we are out of the red. We haven't fished in 20 years and it might take another 20.
- Suggest using the 0/90% for CSTC for under 211,000 and then anything over use the 5/23/23/25% Starret model.
- Suggest that CSTC to work with the LLFA on the dry rack fishery and the option to allow for it. Executive meeting next week. Margo, Pete and Murray to figure out that arrangement; possible to meet the 17th of May.
- 60 fish allowed for a specific study.

DAY THREE

Welcome and prayer.

Early Summer (Pete Nicklin)

- During Two Session: concerns for Bowron.
- Forecast for this year; earlier timed earlier summer.
- Goes to the upper parts of the upper Fraser.
- P50 is 7,000, TAM rule that DFO is proposing, take off mortality, escapement is 3,900. Last year's escapement was 60.
- This is a CU status of red.
- Management option proposed by DFO is actually lower than the lower benchmark by Science.
- Stock reference for Fraser Sockeye.
- Following up on concerns in respect to the stock.
- One week window closure on Early Stuarts (not one done last year).
- This is an extreme conservation concern.
- Need to question the extremely difficulty of this situation.
- FN: Past year's the Bowron Lake entrance used to be full.
- FN: Using actually spawners number will play into what is going to return.
- PN: use only fly overs, no in river walks.
- FN: Has used in river stock assessment, but now program has been cut and there hasn't been enough fish in the river to justify the work. Lake supported 50-75K spawners in the past.
- FN: We need to push DFO to make funds available to walk the streams.
- FN: Raft river runs; just over 10K return, 3,600 had spawning success. Water tested 36-50% success in spawning.
- Wild Salmon Policy states that when a stocks goes below the benchmark, a recovery plan needs to be initiated. Pressure to DFO to get one started.

- FN: Fish farm issues.
- Facilitator: FNFC has a AMAC table and that there is were the traction should come from. Flag in the letter to DFO. Connect Alex Morton with John Henderson. Bob Chamberlain to support.
- MS: CSAS process 2011 attempt bring bench mark together and provide recommendation to the status of Fraser Stocks. Amendments to paper from a workshop a year ago. Final draft in Ottawa and has not come back for public since. Red Zone stock within each management groups on the Fraser.
- FN: Nadina: pre-spawn mortality of 90% another issues.
- FN: Hydro needs to release more water for Nadina at that time of returns. Letter needs to write a letter to Hydro saying to release water to these groups not just early Stuarts.
- FN: 45 fish on grounds and we don't know who they spawn, what chances do they have in the future?
- FN: Adams is getting less and less every year as well.
- FN: Need to come together and fight to protect the creeks that need our support; get Hydro/DFO/etc to step up the plate.
- Facilitator: What are we going to do about Bowron?
- FN: Is the timing closure wrong? Do we need change the closure to over lap on the Early Stuarts? Run in front of the Chilko stock. Recommend to change over lap better.
- PN: Need to ensure that the closure time is helping protect Bowron; take samples of DNA.
- FN: We need know the timing of the fisheries from a biology perspective, may shift year to year, common sense knows that changes slightly happen.
- FN: Need to make the closure decision. Tracy: is going to let people know there will be no fishing until August to protect Bowron and Early Stuart. It does cause stress in communities, but has to done. What do we need to do for consensus to make DFO does this?
- FN: End of July is the peak of the run through Lyton. This mean there will be a pretty extensive closure for Early Stuarts unless they come back stronger.
- FN: Take a little bit of the stock up from, move the closures back a bit to protect the large bulk of Early and Bowron.
- FN: exploitation rate is only 16% and is usually with by-catch. Shifting the window closure over might work.
- FN: when does the window closure start? MS: Area 20 is the first three weeks of July (mouth of River), 4-5 days to Yale, 4-5 day to Williams Lake, and so on.
- Facilitator: Can Mike Staley and Pete Nicklin work out the closure details for FRAFS to write in a letter to DFO. MS: yes.
- **ACTION:** MS and PN to create the details on the window closure (Bowron/Early Stuarts) to send to FRAFS to inform DFO. Shift the closure one week forward.
- FN: Last weekend of July the dry rack fishery is needed; how would those closures affect that? PN: July 1st to 26th in the dry rack area. This would mean the dry rack fishery would have to start 3-4 days later.
- FN: need to be clear on the opening to all communities; especially when communities see others starting before them.
- FN: when the dry racks happen others will want a short opportunity as well (day or so).
- FN: protection of late Adams would be connected with protection of Cultus. Anything less than P50 should move exploitation rate should be 10% on late Adams.
- FN: Chilliwack is outside the aggagrate (wording form last year).

Interior Fraser River Coho (Pete Nicklin)

- April 26th draft of IMFP that DFO based there presentation two days ago.
- DFO changed the coho perimeters quite substantially.

- Not everyone has seen the changes, SCC got changes last week.
- Objective for interior Fraser River coho is to limit the Canadian harvest to 3%-4%. Terminal harvest is not included.
- Fisheries that requested verbally given.
- JTWG requested the information for the justification; but did not receive it.
- Main Issues: consultation is no where near done, technically as well, goes against the TOR (JTWG asked for one piece of specific model that details the impacts of increase of coho; DFO responded that "DFO is keeping in internal for now").
- Recommend that Forum requests the data that is being held back to even consider looking at this increase.
- DFO has stating the excuse "this is a policy decision", there is no up front conversations.
- Pete has asked for the past model; and DFO has not given anything or even created a model for this year.
- Implication for this year is that there are allocated by-catch for interior coho; so who gets that by-catch. DFO is insisted that there is no allocation and is just for fisheries that are already in existence.
- FN: LFFA has asked for more pinks, which DFO interpreted that this would include more interior Fraser coho. Beach seine fisheries has a 1% mortality for coho, and DFO know this through joint work.
- Facilitator: Does the Forum group support the 1% mortality and increase of pinks for Sto:lo?
- FN: FRAFS executive committee needs to look at the issues faced by coho and if ties into larger policy issues with DFO. This isn't support FN capacity.
- FN: Lower Fraser chum fishery includes the coho by-catch. JTWG concern and transparency; needs to be included in letter. Continued pressure for commercial fisheries looking at selective fisheries.
- FN: Study for Sto:lo and DFO exploitation rate? Good to have to support a letter.
- MS: CSAS paper that has been released that looks at the COSEWIC on interior Fraser coho; benchmark is 35,000 and the expectation is 42,000, limited to 20% exploitation. Interior Fraser is no longer in the lower range, but middle range. Coho interior Fraser is still in low abundance. Using the 7-9 table in the IFMP. Moved from 3-12% and the treaty state that we are not in low anymore and opens it up for US fisheries.
- FN: In accordance with the TOR of the JTWG in the process of information sharing not being adhered to; Forum cannot make a decision to support the 1% increase until the JTWG has the proper data to make an informed examination. Then following the JTWG review to make the decision to inform DFO. Area G troll September and WCVI recreational in October are directed fisheries on coho with some impacts on interior Fraser coho. Even with the forecast amount; historically this is still as minimal amount.

Chinook – Peter Nicklin

- Delayed for looking at CWT data analysis due to staffing issues within DFO.
- Beginning of June for any substantial conversations.
- Information won't be available until Chuck Parkin is ready.
- FN: challenging for FN to participate in decision making when delays in information are happening; then sports are continued to allow to fish. This is the last Forum and knew this was coming and didn't supply the JTWG with the best information possible.
- FN: Questioning the transparency; FN have a management model yet can't more forward.