

Summary Report
Socio-Economic
Workshop for the
Central and North
Coast of B.C.
Richmond, B.C.
November 9-10, 2000

Prepared for
The Joint Solutions Project

Prepared by Dovetail Consulting Inc.

November 27, 2000

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of this Report	1
1.2 Additional Documentation	1
1.3 For More Information	2
2. Workshop Rationale and Objectives	3
2.1 Background and Rationale	3
2.2 Objectives.....	3
2.3 Participants.....	4
3. Workshop Results	5
3.1 Opening Remarks and Introductions	5
3.2 Opening Presentations and Discussion.....	5
3.2.1 Overview and Update on the Joint Solutions Project.....	5
3.2.2 Questions and Discussion on the Joint Solutions Project.....	6
3.2.3 Origin and Scope of the Socio-Economic Discussion Themes.....	8
3.3 Plenary Discussion: Initial Review of Socio-Economic Discussion Themes.....	9
3.4 Summary of Key Points from Working Group Discussions.....	11
3.4.1 Conservation-based Economy	11
3.4.2 Capacity Building.....	12
3.4.3 Local and Regional Economic Self-Determination	14
3.4.4 Investment and Venture Capital	16
3.4.5 Summary Comments	17
3.5 First Panel Discussion: <i>Moving Forward on the Theme Areas</i>	17
3.5.1 Presentation: Robert Prescott-Allen.....	18
3.5.2 Presentation: Robert Lee.....	18
3.5.3 Presentation: Pete Morton.....	19
3.5.4 Presentation: William Stanbury.....	20
3.5.5 Plenary Question and Answer Session.....	21
3.6 Second Panel Discussion: <i>Moving Forward on the Theme Areas</i>	23
3.6.1 Presentation: Tom Power	23
3.6.2 Presentation: David Berge.....	24
3.6.3 Presentation: Roslyn Kunin.....	25
3.6.4 Plenary Question and Answer Session.....	26
3.7 Plenary Discussion: Assessment Team Priorities, Projects and Deliverables	27
3.8 Concluding Remarks: <i>Sam Moody and Patricia McKim</i>	29
3.9 Closing Comments: <i>Merran Smith and Linda Coady</i>	29
Appendix 1: Discussion Points for November Workshop	31
Appendix 2: List of Participants	34

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results of a two day workshop held on November 9-10, 2000 in Richmond B.C., and convened by the Joint Solutions Project. The objectives of the workshop were to:

- provide accurate and up-to-date information regarding the Joint Solutions Project;
- develop and refine the scope and intent of socio-economic work to be undertaken as part of the Joint Solutions Project, including approach and timeline;
- identify and refine key issues and related research questions to be addressed by a proposed Assessment Team comprised of local and international specialists;
- identify methodologies and analytical approaches suitable for use by the proposed Assessment Team, and clarify key socioeconomic elements of their terms of reference; and,
- identify opportunities for on-going participation by all parties in the initiative.

Overview and Update on the Joint Solutions Project

Linda Coady and Merran Smith provided an overview and update on the Joint Solutions Project. The purpose of the Joint Solutions Project is to generate information, analyses, options and recommendations on ecosystem management and economic strategies and opportunities that can be used in a variety of decision making processes in the Central and North Coast. A key initiative of the Joint Solutions Project is to create an Assessment Team to bring forward new information, ideas and advice, with representation on the team from internationally respected scientific and economic advisors, individuals with local expertise, and First Nations representatives. The initiative is evolving to be directed by a multi-group steering committee. Discussions are underway with First Nations, communities, workers, contractors and government around the project management structure, and the design will reflect the input of the emerging committee.

In the opening plenary, key issues raised by workshop participants included the following:

- the appropriate role of science and scientists in this process;
- the history of exploitation of First Nations' territories and resources and the need to address jurisdictional issues through interim measures agreements;
- coordination and leadership among the ENGOs on the coast, and the perceived fragility of the ENGO coalition; and,
- the imperative for local communities to be involved, and local expertise to be sought, in this initiative.

Origin, Scope and Initial Review of Socio-Economic Discussion Themes

Sean Markey reviewed the four socio-economic discussion themes that were proposed to provide structure for discussions at this workshop. The four themes are: Conservation-based Economy; Capacity Building; Community and Regional Economic Self-Determination; and, Investment and Venture Capital. Sam Moody of the Economic Development Office of the Nuxalk First Nation provided context by noting that economic opportunities are scarce for many First Nations people on the coast. He highlighted the need to build trust through a new framework of cooperation between First Nations and others. Issues highlighted in the following plenary discussion include:

- the critical need for good communication with and among communities and parties involved in this initiative;
- the need for information on structural changes and technological adjustment within the forest industry;
- concerns over the apparent lack of attention to the social costs of dislocation and change caused by the initiative;
- the need for an operational definition of the Precautionary Principle;
- the need for clear goals and targets for this initiative, and community involvement in the development of these goals and targets;
- the limitations to value-added forestry on the coast;
- the availability of government programs and funds to support this work;
- the existing institutional context which may be an impediment to local economic diversification (e.g. Bill 13);
- the need to identify capacity building requirements at the local, regional and provincial levels;
- limits to the availability of human resources on the coast;
- the need to understand revenue flows from government programs and other subsidies;
- the need to acknowledge the limits to the demand for ‘new economy initiatives’ such as eco-tourism;
- recognition of local planning and analysis capability;
- an examination of the role of property rights in providing a secure basis for economic development;
- the need to compile existing information and expertise;
- the role of the proposed *Regional and Community Development Act* and its relevance to this initiative; and,
- the need to draw on experience from other areas of North America as well as other parts of the world.

Summary of Key Points from Working Group Discussions

Key issues raised in working group sessions include:

Conservation-based Economy

- the need for a clear definition of a “conservation-based economy;”
- integrating human well-being into the concept of a conservation-based economy;
- the need to identify the appropriate geographic scale of analysis;
- developing a clear understanding of the impacts of economic transition;
- examining the role of value-added forestry;
- the need to develop a range of ecological options to be assessed, in terms of the specific ecological benefits they generate, and their likely social and economic impacts;
- developing valuation tools to assess complex options, involving both monetary and non-monetary values;
- addressing the extent to which local communities should be export-based, and how money and resources can be circulated within the economy; and,
- determining the extent to which environmental and social amenities might be a factor in the location of knowledge based enterprises on the Central and North Coast.

Capacity Building

- understanding the link between personal and community wellness as a foundation for other kinds of capacity building;
- determining the scale and focus of capacity building which varies by coastal community;
- identifying ‘keystone’ capacity building opportunities;
- determining whether there are community-based research and planning processes that are effective in helping communities define their own priorities;
- building trust among local communities;
- identifying specific outcomes, and creating accountability to achieve those outcomes;
- directing effort to bring the capital and expertise of existing contractors into new partnerships with local communities, and to find role models in the industry that can be used to generate local benefits;
- providing mechanisms to ensure that positive experiences with forming partnerships are institutionalized and replicated; and,
- identifying tools, policies, and entitlements that government needs to devolve to communities in order for them to have meaningful capacity development.

Local and Regional Economic Self-Determination

- recognizing the importance of “place” and people’s desire to remain where they live;

- acknowledging existing mechanisms for self-determination and people’s right to chose their future;
- recognizing barriers to self-determination and developing the means to broaden the range of options available to communities;
- recognizing the effects of policies that promote centralization versus regionalization;
- acknowledging that building trust is key to community and regional economic self-determination, particularly between Native and non-Native communities;
- acknowledging the demographics on the coast, particularly with respect to population growth in First Nations communities;
- acknowledging the need to resolve aboriginal rights and title as a foundation for ensuring economic self-determination for First Nations;
- acknowledging that the proposed Assessment Team should set a good example by having an equitable structure itself, with equal opportunity for local people to do collaborative research with outside specialists, with a focus on practical results relevant to local people; and,
- recognizing the limitations to economic development that exist on the coast due to the geography of the area and the remoteness.

Investment and Venture Capital

- understanding the role of financial capital is a necessary ingredient for economic development, especially with respect to the needs of smaller scale enterprises; and,
- recognizing the need for a clear and simple investment story to attract philanthropic and social capital.

Panel Discussions: Moving Forward on the Theme Areas

The following is a highlight of key points made by panelists:

- Robert Prescott-Allen emphasized the need to: define the essential elements of “well-being” of ecosystems and communities and elaborate goals and objectives with respect to these; establish a meta-database of information; assess current conditions; and, ensure a permanent point of access for communities to the assessment data and analysis.
- Robert Lee suggested some specific policy questions that need to be addressed: How can decentralization of authority take place? What political instruments will enhance this decentralization? How can self-determination be fostered? And, What strategy could best help the adjustment of those affected by change?
- Pete Morton stressed the need to: develop inventories of non-timber resource values; put in place proper monitoring systems; focus on value-added and producing high-quality saw log timber; explore revenue sharing arrangements with tourism operators; examine telecommunications infrastructure as a potential keystone capacity building initiative; and, understand the extent of the sustenance economy on the coast.

- William Stanbury suggested some specific research and analytical approaches that should be adopted: solicit the preferences of people in the region, and elsewhere in B.C., for the options being proposed; identify and measure the environmental benefits and trade-offs associated with the options proposed; study the major structural changes that are underway in the forest sector, in terms of efficiency and their distributional consequences; outline and understand several potential scenarios of aboriginal title settlement; and, develop options and strategies for making the adjustment from a forestry-dependent economy, focusing on the required response of specific actors.
- Tom Power emphasized the need to recognize the self-adjusting capacity of economies and the importance of distinguishing between different geographic economies. He highlighted the importance of social and environmental amenities as an increasingly important factor in attracting knowledge-based enterprises to a community or region.
- David Berge noted the complexity of the situation on the coast, and the lack of basic infrastructure, are impediments to attracting outside investment. He stressed that foundations and investors need a simple and compelling story; clarity of vision is therefore critical to success.
- Roslyn Kunin stressed the growing disparity between urban and rural economies in B.C. She noted that there are acute and basic concerns about the ability of many rural communities to retain jobs and income. She suggested incorporating sustainable development indicators into the assessment work for the coast in an effort to have clearer goals and performance benchmarks; using cost-benefit analysis as an assessment tool; and, focusing on developing human resource skills in local communities.

Plenary Question and Answer Session

Key issues raised in a plenary discussion following the panelists' presentations include:

- exploring the potential for a cruise ship levy as a revenue generating tool;
- understanding the appropriate use of cost-benefit analysis as a socio-economic assessment tool;
- assessing whether the costs of forest harvest reductions outweigh the benefits;
- putting in place proper monitoring systems;
- integrating native spirituality with western science;
- understanding and addressing the linkages between structural changes in the forest industry and the market and societal forces affecting fibre supply;
- learning from the experience of U.S. Pacific Northwest communities that faced similar changes;
- identifying keystone capacity building opportunities;
- empowering communities to use information and analysis for their own benefit;

- ensuring a common understanding of the current socio-economic baseline; and,
- using philanthropic capital as risk capital to lay the foundation to attract broader social capital.

Assessment Team priorities, projects and deliverables

Key issues and suggestions made with respect to the initial priorities for the proposed Assessment Team were as follows:

- The work must be undertaken from the communities affected, and must not be a top-down process.
- The Assessment Team should develop practical tools but people should not have unreasonable expectations for how fast implementation can occur.
- As a priority over the next 6 months, the Assessment Team should develop an eco-forestry plan that outlines ecological options, a new economy plan that deals with economic transition, and a land claims plan that outlines the scenarios that might occur through treaty settlement.
- Assessments should not be “one-off” studies; they should be framed to ensure on-going adaptive learning.
- The research process should be inclusive of all parties and involve a collaboration between researchers and local community development practitioners to frame the appropriate research questions.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report summarizes the results of a two day workshop held on November 9-10, 2000 in Richmond B.C., and convened by the Joint Solutions Project, formerly known as the Coastal Forest Conservation Initiative (CFCI)/Environmental Non-Government Organizations (ENGO) Steering Committee.

This event was planned and organized by a Planning Group consisting of the following individuals: Alex Grzybowski; Lisa Matthaus; James Pratt; Patrick Armstrong; Brenda Armstrong; Larry Stranberg; Norman Dale; Keith Hamilton; Sean Markey; Julian Griggs; Karin Foreman; Abbie Milavsky; Bryan Evans; and, Sarah Fraser.

This report has been prepared by the workshop facilitators for distribution to participants and other interested parties.

1.2 Additional Documentation

The following materials were distributed or made available at the workshop and can be obtained from Karin Foreman at Alex Gryzbowski and Associates Ltd.:

- *Collaborative Development of an Ecosystem-Based Planning Framework, Draft 4 October 3rd, 2000;*
- Dovetail Consulting Inc. October 12th, 2000. *Summary Report, CED Scoping Session for the Central and North Coast, Richmond, B.C., October 5, 2000;*
- James Pratt Consulting. *CEC Scoping Session for the Central and North Coast: Executive Summary;*
- *The Central and North Coast of British Columbia: A Socio-economic Profile, Draft, October 30, 2000;*¹
- Pojar et al. December 1999. *Silvicultural Options in the Central Coast* (excerpt);
- *Questions and Answers on the CFCI/ENGO Initiative;*
- *Overview of the Proposed Joint Solutions Project's Anticipated Coast Ecosystem Management and Socio-economic Assessment Work:* and,
- *Summary Profile for Panelists.*

¹ Note that the socio-economic profile is a draft; further work is needed to refine this baseline information.

1.3 For More Information

For further information regarding the Joint Solutions Project, or this Socio-Economic Workshop, please contact:

Alex Grzybowski
Joint Solutions Project Facilitator
Alex Grzybowski & Associates Ltd.
515 Norris Road
Sidney, B.C. V8L 5M8
Phone: 250-656-1317
Fax: 250-656-1357
Email: grzybowski@tnet.net

2. WORKSHOP RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 Background and Rationale

The purpose of the Joint Solutions Project is to promote approaches to management and conservation of forests in the Central and North Coast of British Columbia that will maintain the ecological integrity of critical forest ecosystems while meeting local social, cultural and economic requirements.

Those most closely involved in the initiative to date include the Coastal Rainforest Coalition, Rainforest Action Network and Sierra Club of BC, Canfor, Norske Skog, Western Forest Products and Weyerhaeuser Canada. The group has agreed upon a set of core principles and goals to govern their approach to dealing with ecological, social, cultural and economic factors.²

The Joint Solutions Project is a technical resource aimed at providing formal decision-making bodies (i.e. LRMPs, First Nations, forest managers) with information and options that may not otherwise be available to them.

The Joint Solutions Project has agreed to sponsor collaborative work on an ecosystem-based planning framework for the Central and North Coast regions of British Columbia. Those involved in the initiative believe such an approach will contribute to the discussions taking place within current planning processes, as well as assisting in the development of an approach to planning and community economic development that will receive broad-based local, provincial and international acceptance.

The purpose of the November 9-10 workshop was to help design the socioeconomic terms of reference for a proposed Assessment Team. The Assessment Team, consisting of local and international specialists, will address both ecological and socioeconomic considerations. An earlier workshop provided guidance on ecological considerations.

2.2 Objectives

The objectives of the November 9-10 workshop were to:

- provide accurate and up-to-date information regarding the Joint Solutions Project;
- develop and refine the scope and intent of socio-economic work to be undertaken as part of the Joint Solutions Project, including approach and timeline;
- identify and refine key issues and related research questions to be addressed by a proposed Assessment Team comprised of local and international specialists;

² see *Collaborative Development of an Ecosystem-based Planning Framework*. Draft 4 October 3rd, 2000.

- identify methodologies and analytical approaches suitable for use by the proposed Assessment Team, and clarify key socioeconomic elements of their terms of reference; and,
- identify opportunities for on-going participation by all parties in the initiative.

2.3 Participants

More than 60 people attended the workshop, in addition to support staff. Participants included representatives from First Nations, local communities, industry, environmental non-governmental organizations, and provincial government agencies (See Appendix 2 for a list of participants).

3. WORKSHOP RESULTS

3.1 Opening Remarks and Introductions

Linda Coady of Weyerhaeuser Company Limited and Merran Smith of the Sierra Club of British Columbia welcomed all participants (and led the workshop in a stirring rendition of a song penned by Bill Beese of Weyerhaeuser called *Old Growth*, sung to the tune of *Downtown*).

Merran reminded people that a similar meeting was held on July 15th, 2000 to discuss the ecological aspects of the Joint Solutions Project. This second workshop focused on the socioeconomic aspects of the initiative and exploring opportunities for economic diversification in the Central and North Coast. Merran introduced the panel members (see Appendix 2: List of Participants). The panel members are recognized local and international specialists who were invited to the workshop to provide expert advice on appropriate ways in which the Joint Solutions Project can contribute to the economic future of the Central and North Coast. Linda Coady also thanked the planning group and support staff who had helped to organize the workshop.

3.2 Opening Presentations and Discussion

3.2.1 Overview and Update on the Joint Solutions Project

Linda Coady and Merran Smith provided an overview and update on the Joint Solutions Project, highlighting the following:

- *What is the Joint Solutions Project?* The Joint Solutions Project is an initiative to promote new solutions to forest issues in the Central and North Coast of British Columbia.
- *Origins:* The initiative came about as a result of a number of concurrent factors:
 - a recognition that B.C.'s rainforests are globally significant;
 - a realization that international markets for forest products are a factor in forest stewardship requiring solutions that are credible locally and internationally;
 - a recognition that solutions to forest conflicts on the coast cannot be limited by current government policies and that economic and community health must be linked to new forestry and ecosystem management; and,
 - a commitment by forest companies and ENGOS to move beyond structured conflict to co-design new options rather than negotiate around existing options.
- *Purpose:* The purpose of the Joint Solutions Project is to generate information, analyses, options and recommendations on ecosystem management and economic

strategies and opportunities. Information generated by the Joint Solutions Project can be used in a variety of decision making processes, such as multi-party land use planning processes, First Nations land use planning, and interim measures discussions. It was emphasized that the Joint Solutions Project is not a planning or decision making process.

- *Activities to date:* There is agreement to maintain a standstill in logging in some areas in the Central Coast and in market campaigns against participating companies. Draft Principles and Goals of Ecosystem Based Planning are being developed. Support and funds are in place for the concept of an independent team of specialists to provide options. Some preliminary technical analysis has been undertaken (e.g. gathering data, socioeconomic profile, impacts of deferrals) and discussions are underway to broaden participation in all aspects of the initiative among First Nations, local communities, and others.³
- *Next steps:* There is emerging agreement to create an Assessment Team to bring forward new information, ideas and advice, with representation on the team from internationally respected scientific and economic advisors, individuals with local expertise, and First Nations representatives. The initiative is evolving to be directed by a multi-group steering committee. Discussions are underway with First Nations, communities, workers, contractors and government around the project management structure, and the design will reflect the input of the emerging committee.

Linda Coady concluded by stating that change is needed on the coast, but it must be done in an orderly, just and effective manner. Weyerhaeuser is guided by the experience in Clayoquot Sound. MacMillan Bloedel did not have a plan to deal with the disruption that arose from the boycotts of wood products from Clayoquot Sound, which led to great hardship for local communities. All efforts must be made to ensure that this hardship is avoided or mitigated in the Central and North Coast. Linda also emphasized the opportunities to bring venture capital and alternative investment to bear on solutions for the Central and North Coast.

Merran concluded that two issues were central to making progress: moving forward on interim measures agreements, and supporting community economic diversification in the Central and North Coast.

3.2.2 Questions and Discussion on the Joint Solutions Project

In the discussion that followed, the following points were raised:

- *Sanctity of science:* Concern was expressed that scientists and scientific opinion not be given undue weight in this process. First Nations experience suggests that scientific studies can be commissioned to “validate a pre-ordained opinion” on either side of any debate.

³ One participant provided detailed information at the workshop on population and income dependencies for communities in the Central and North Coast, which are available from Karin Foreman at Alex Grzybowski and Associates. However, this data was questioned by another participant.

- *Stewardship and economic opportunities for First Nations:* Concern was expressed that the traditional territories and resources of the First Nations people of the coast have been “high-graded”, making it difficult for First Nations to move to better stewardship without facing economic hardship and further loss of economic opportunities. If First Nations are being asked not to harvest resources to meet environmental goals – and First Nations support some of these goals - then First Nations “will need to be compensated to operate at a lower level than the industry has in the past.”
- *Resolution of jurisdiction:* The provincial and federal government must address jurisdictional issues and reach agreement on delegation of authority to First Nations through interim measures agreements. Agreements need to be in place to recognize First Nations rights and provide opportunities for First Nations and industry to find joint solutions to resource management issues using an “objectives-based approach,” particularly with respect to marine resources.
- *Leadership in the environmental community:* First Nations want more coordination between ENGOs on the coast, particularly with respect to the links between the Joint Solutions Project and the Turning Points initiative of the David Suzuki Foundation. First Nations want ENGOs to “get your act together and have one leadership.” Merran Smith responded that the Turning Points initiative is a political initiative aimed at helping First Nations achieve interim measures agreements and other objectives, whereas the Joint Solutions Project is an apolitical process to create information, analysis and opportunities for policy makers and others to consider. Linda Coady noted that the Joint Solutions Project sponsors are in on-going discussions with a First Nations steering committee on points of convergence between the two initiatives.
- *Local involvement, orderly change:* It was noted that it is vital that local communities be involved in this initiative and that local expertise be sought. The goal of many local communities is to keep the economy moving along and that means to “sustain and create jobs.” It was noted that there are parallels between this initiative and the Islands Community Stability Initiative (ICSI), which was a locally-driven initiative on Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte Islands.
- *Fragility of ENGO coalition:* Concern was expressed at the fragility of the ENGO coalition involved in this initiative given Greenpeace’s recent decision to target some purchases of wood products in the Central and North Coast. Merran Smith stated the Sierra Club of BC, the Canadian Rainforest Coalition and the Rainforest Action Network remain strongly committed to this initiative. Greenpeace has also agreed to support the process and will be attending the workshop. Linda Coady stated that Weyerhaeuser feels that Greenpeace is in conflict with the spirit and intent of the agreement between ENGOs and the forest companies given their market activities in Europe. There is a dispute resolution process underway to resolve these issues, but this has not reached a conclusion. As a result, Weyerhaeuser is not currently engaging in discussions with Greenpeace with respect to this initiative.

3.2.3 Origin and Scope of the Socio-Economic Discussion Themes

Sean Markey⁴ presented a summary of the results of a Community Economic Development Scoping Session held in advance of this workshop on October 5, 2000. The session brought together 10 community economic development practitioners with representatives of the Joint Solutions Project to generate initial ideas on program priorities for the socioeconomic assessment work to be undertaken in the Central and North Coast.

Based on input at this scoping session, four socioeconomic ‘themes’ were proposed to provide structure for discussion at this workshop. Sean provided an overview of the proposed themes and suggested research questions under each theme (See Appendix 1: Discussion Points for November Workshop). The four themes are:

- Conservation-based Economy;
- Capacity Building;
- Community and Regional Economic Self-Determination; and,
- Investment and Venture Capital.

Sam Moody of the Economic Development Office of the Nuxalk First Nation added that economic opportunities are “non-existent or very limited” for many First Nations people on the coast. He felt that capacity building for First Nations is central to long-term socio-economic development and that value added forestry is a key focus. Sam noted that the Nuxalk First Nation are in the process of adopting a community healing program with over 50% of community going through difficult emotional issues as a result of the residential school experience. He felt that the trauma of residential schools has made it difficult for many First Nations members to engage in economic opportunities. The current unemployment rate is 80-90%. He stated that there is a need to “establish a framework of cooperation to overcome some very serious trust issues.” There is a need to develop new working relationships and address the lack of technical expertise and experience in communities. Skills need to be developed broadly in the community, and not just in one or two people. He concluded that “we know the challenges are there and we are hoping to take them on.”

⁴ Sean participated in the Community Economic Development Scoping Session held in advance of this workshop and was one of the members of a Planning Group formed to assist the Joint Solutions Project sponsors with organizing this workshop.

3.3 Plenary Discussion: Initial Review of Socio-Economic Discussion Themes

Workshop participants were asked to provide initial comment on the proposed themes and research questions, specifically addressing the following questions:

- Do the four themes adequately cover the most important socio-economic issues for the coast?
- For each one, are the research questions appropriate?
- What, if anything, is missing?
- What are your initial reactions to the potential projects identified?

Highlights of the plenary discussions are as follows:

- *Communications:* Communication with and among communities and parties involved in this initiative is critical – both in terms of communications infrastructure capacity building over the medium term, and communication regarding the Joint Solutions Project in the short term.
- *Structural change in the forest industry:* Several individuals noted that information on structural changes and technological adjustment within the forest industry is missing from the materials assembled to date, particularly in relation to international markets.
- *Costs and impacts of change:* Concerns were expressed over the apparent lack of attention to the social costs of dislocation and change caused by the initiative. It was argued that the coastal forest industry has provincial significance, and that the impacts on forest workers – whether they reside on the coast, or elsewhere – has not been adequately taken into account. (It was also noted that when Gwaii Hanaas was created, many of the impacts were most keenly felt by forest workers who reside in Nanaimo, as well as on the Queen Charlotte Islands).
- *Application of the precautionary principle:* An operational definition of the Precautionary Principle should be integrated into discussions of what is meant by a ‘conservation-based economy.’
- *Principle of adjacency:* It was noted that there is ambiguity over the extent to which local residents should have control over local resources.
- *Need for clear goals:* The initiative needs clear goals and targets. (It was acknowledged that the ‘principles and goals’ section of the *Preliminary Ecosystem Based Framework* provides some guidance in this regard). One participant referred to the “Oregon Benchmarks” example, which has enabled that state to guide and track their progress towards agreed targets, and that serves as a catalyst for collaboration.⁵ Another participant noted that communities themselves need to identify and

⁵ Additional information on Oregon’s benchmarking process is available from www.econ.state.or.us/opb/orsh.html

articulate their own goals, and suggested the initiative should explore how to provide the capacity for them to do so.

- *Perceived failure of value added policy:* It was suggested that efforts to expand value added manufacturing have been a “dismal failure in B.C.” In one example, stumpage has reduced the value of raw materials and the majority of the best wood is already gone. It was also noted that what is left “are some of the poorest and steepest areas left on the coast.” Participants cautioned those involved in this initiative not to “jump on the bandwagon” without careful consideration of how financing could be attracted to support economic diversification in light of the stumpage appraisal system and an understanding of the species profiles that remain.
- *Availability of government funds:* It was noted that there are federal dollars available for capacity development in some areas. One suggested that the doors to access this funding “could be pushed wider open with this kind of initiative.”
- *Institutional context:* One participant stressed that the capacity building and transition initiatives must acknowledge the institutional context in which they are set. For example, it was noted that Bill 13 affects local communities’ access to wood and employment opportunities. It was acknowledged that contracts required under Bill 13 discourage joint ventures between some companies and local native bands.
- *Capacity building at all levels:* It was noted that capacity building needs to occur not just at the local, but also at the regional and provincial levels – within environmental organizations, governments and industry. “Part of this initiative is an opportunity to improve economic literacy on all fronts.”
- *Human resource capacity:* One participant noted that human resource availability needs to be understood. For example, are people leaving the coast? What are the education levels? It was also stressed that human resources take time to develop, and change is often incremental.
- *Revenue flows:* It was suggested that the Joint Solutions Project examine the revenue flows from government programs and other ‘subsidies’ into the coastal region, and seek to determine whether these funds are being used effectively so as to capture the best return, or value, from the investment. Another participant noted that a clear definition of both ‘subsidy’ and ‘value’ is needed.
- *Limits to demand:* One participant urged those involved in the initiative to acknowledge the limits to the demand for ‘new economy initiatives.’ It was pointed out, for example, that there have been 20 LRMPs in BC to date, and every one of them has identified the potential for eco-tourism.
- *Recognition of local planning and analysis capability:* Parties involved in the initiative were encouraged to recognize local capabilities for economic planning and development. For example, a significant local study has just been completed on minerals, botanical products and tourism. Further detailed and locally-grounded studies are also planned.
- *Property rights:* It was suggested that just as First Nations see security of title to land as a key component of their economic and political aspirations, so too local non-Native communities may need certainty in terms of property rights to provide the

basis for economic development. One participant stressed that investment will not be forthcoming unless there is such security. Others countered that the coastal forest contain values that are not currently well recognized in a property rights framework – such as carbon, biodiversity, species, habitats and water.

- *An inventory of what we have inventoried:* It was suggested that one major contribution from the initiative could be a compilation of existing information and expertise. This inventory would need to capture local information, “...for it is only at that level that you can really measure social capital.” (It was noted that considerable data has already been assembled through the ‘Resilient Community Project,’ at UBC).
- *Regional and Community Development Act:* It was noted that a new Act is under development by the Ministry of Community Development, Cooperatives and Volunteers, and may have particular relevance to this initiative.
- *Drawing experience from other areas:* Several participants argued that this initiative needs to draw experience from other areas of North America as well as other parts of the world.

3.4 Summary of Key Points from Working Group Discussions

Workshop participants spent approximately two hours in break-out working groups discussing the scope and proposed research questions under each major socioeconomic theme. Working group participants were asked to address the following questions:

- Bearing in mind the comments from this morning, is the scope of the theme appropriate?
- Are the research questions appropriate?
- What additional questions might be considered, and why?
- What will answers to these questions contribute to the socio-economic future of the coast?

The following summaries highlight key discussion points and comments from these working group sessions. Note, there was no attempt to reach formal agreement at the working group level on the points listed below.

3.4.1 Conservation-based Economy

- *Clear definition:* The meaning of a “conservation-based economy” needs to be clearly defined as it provides an over-arching point of reference.
- *Human and ecosystem well-being:* Human well-being is an integral part of a conservation-based economy and needs to be given due consideration along with ecological health and economics. A conservation-based economy should “promote human and ecosystem well-being together” so that people and the environment are both “better off in the full sense.”

- *Scale:* The geographic scale of analysis needs to be considered: it can be local, provincial, or international.
- *Impacts of transition:* One participant felt that the reduction in logging will result in a “dramatic drop in the well-being of communities” on the coast. Another participant suggested that transition would require everyone to “take a bath”, especially given the relatively high wages in the forest sector compared with other sectors of the economy. It was noted, however, that structural and technological change in the industry, and overcutting, are major causes of income and job loss in the forest industry, and that the capacity of the economy to naturally replace jobs should not be underestimated. Another person stated that a goal of this initiative should be to understand who benefits and who loses at all levels of the provincial economy as a result of this transition.
- *Value added:* One participant stated that the forest industry focus on high-volume lumber production, rather than value-added, is an obstacle to implementing a conservation-based economy and is a “bone of contention” for First Nations and ENGOs. Another participant argued that value-added is not really feasible in BC given the high wage environment.
- *Assessing options:* One participant suggested that ecological options should be assessed in terms of how they address broad goals to “have a healthy vibrant environment.” Another participant stressed that people must be “quite sure of what we are doing” in terms of ecological options – the specific benefits they generate, and their likely social and economic impacts and associated opportunities. It was suggested that assessments could be done iteratively, by looking first at a series of ecological options, and then their social and economic consequences and implications.
- *Methods of valuation:* It was suggested that non-monetary values cannot be measured alongside strictly economic, or monetary, outcomes; some neutral scale of performance measurement would have to be applied. Methods of valuation need to be developed to help people make sensible decisions about complex options.
- *External versus internal economies:* One participant suggested that communities need to make a decision around the extent to which local economies will be export-based, and how money and resources can be circulated within the economy.
- *Amenity-based settlement:* It was noted that increasingly in the knowledge-based economy, the quality of environmental and social amenities is a determining factor in the location of knowledge based enterprises. The extent of this influence on the coast should be assessed.

3.4.2 Capacity Building

- *Meaning of capacity building:* Participants offered a variety of interpretations of what capacity building means, for example: “developing the skills and expertise to allow First Nations to get into resource development”; “sustained community economic development”; “building human and technological infrastructure to support

communities”; “access to credit, local investment capital, planning and research capabilities, and equity.”

- *Linkages*: It was suggested that capacity building is linked to two related issues: personal and community wellness; and, access to resources (natural and technical). Community well-being, in the social sense, is a prerequisite to other capacity building efforts.
- *Scale of capacity building*: It was noted that there needs to be a determination of the scale and focus of capacity building: coastal communities are different sizes, with different capacities and relationships. Also, different kinds of capacity need to be located at the regional level and sub-regional levels.
- *'Keystone' capacity building*: It was suggested that there is a need to identify strategic 'keystone' capacity building initiatives that will have a cascading effect, enabling capacity building at several levels. This can only be achieved by bringing community members together to talk about capacity, “... you set up a feedback loop that allows all these people ... to hang together in a community process that is community-based and that allows for things that are fictitious to fall away and the real priorities to surface to the top.”
- *Community-based research and planning*: There is a need to determine whether there are community-based research and planning processes that are effective in helping communities define priorities. How are community and regional priorities linked?
- *Building trust among local communities*: One participant suggested that one of the biggest issues in capacity building is “redressing the distrust between aboriginal and non-aboriginal communities...the communities depend on one another and the locals don't realize it enough.” Effort is needed to develop cooperative attitudes, practices, and proactive relationships between First Nations and non First Nations communities.
- *Outcome-based planning*: One participant noted that “people need to see that they all want the same thing by stating what the desired outcomes are and creating accountability to achieve those outcomes.” Another participant suggested that specific capacity building projects should be identified for individual communities rather than trying to achieve coast-wide agreement.
- *Developing new partnerships*: Some participants suggested Bill 13 is an obstacle to local economic development. Others countered that contractors are willing and interested in developing good business relationships with local communities and First Nations. Effort needs to be directed to bring the capital and expertise of existing contractors into new partnerships with local communities, and to find role models in the industry that can be used to generate local benefits.
- *Institutionalizing capacity building*: It was suggested that positive experiences with forming partnerships need to be institutionalized and replicated. Also, the tools, policies, and entitlements that government needs to devolve to communities in order for them to have meaningful capacity development should be identified.

3.4.3 Local and Regional Economic Self-Determination

Two groups addressed the theme of local and regional economic self-determination. Key discussion points from one group were as follows:

- *Importance of place:* It was noted that self determination should recognize and validate people's decision to locate in a particular place. There is a need to respect that some communities are very small but nonetheless important and valid. There is a need to "look at who is in the community and why they are there."
- *Community aspirations:* It was suggested that there is a need to look at what mechanisms for self-determination are already in place in communities, and determine what communities long-term aspirations are. Self-determination also means letting communities "decide what they do not want."
- *Barriers to self-determination:* One participant suggested that the focus of assessment work should be on identifying the barriers to economic self-determination – such as electrical zone rates on commercial and industrial businesses compared with individual rates, which discourages enterprise. Others countered that it is equally important to focus on positive goals and attitudes, and where the community wants to go rather than barriers.
- *Centralization versus regionalization:* There is a need to undertake an analysis of larger scale trends and determine how these trends affect communities. For example, centralization of services and infrastructure was seen as a negative influence on community self-determination. Regionalization, on the other hand, has been a positive influence on self-determination but requires government and industry buy-in to retain jobs and activity in the regions.
- *Additional research questions:* This group developed some specific research questions to be addressed by the assessment team:
 - look at what works and what does not;
 - access what has already been done;
 - assess community goals;
 - gain clear understanding of where and by whom decisions are made;
 - look at scale of technologies;
 - look at small business programs in other areas; and,
 - initiate discussions on what changes to legislation (e.g. the *Forest Act*) would benefit communities.

A second working group addressing the same theme raised the following key points:

- *Trust:* Several participants commented that trust building is key to community and regional economic self-determination. Establishing a higher level of trust particularly between Native and non-Native communities will be a prerequisite to building local capacity. All parties need to acknowledge their common interests while respecting each others differences.

- *Community healing:* Many First Nations people are struggling with the legacy of the residential school system and the trauma it produced. Many First Nations have “lost touch” with the land and the opportunities they have in front of them. It will take a lot of training and assistance for many First Nations people to develop the skills and individual well-being needed to take advantage of economic opportunities. Community healing will therefore be an integral part of promoting economic self-determination.
- *Defining self-determination:* One participant suggested a definition of self-determination as a means by which a community “defines where it wants to go and understands the short, medium and long-term options that can be developed to get there.” Integral to this is developing the means to broaden the range of options available to the community.
 - *Demographics:* One participant complimented the support materials produced for the workshop, but noted that the demographic situation in First Nations communities has been overlooked. For example, population growth in the Nuxalk First Nation is 1.7 to 2% annually, which means that over 100 babies have been born since the Central Coast LRMP was started. Also, people should recognize the transient nature of many of the workers on the coast, particularly from industry and government.
 - *Aboriginal rights and title and equal access to jobs:* It was noted that resolution of aboriginal rights and title is fundamental to ensuring economic self-determination for First Nations.
 - *Structural impediments to self-determination:* One participant commented that Bill 13 is a “brick wall” that has been built around First Nations and a “huge obstacle” to economic development. Others commented that the timber tenure system is a major structural impediment to local economic self-determination and control of resources.
 - *Structure of proposed assessment team:* One participant commented that the proposed socioeconomic assessment team could set a good example by having an equitable structure itself, with equal opportunity for local people to do collaborative research with outside specialists, with a focus on practical results relevant to local people.
 - *Assessment of impediments:* One participant suggested that it would be valuable to examine the limitations to economic development that exist on the coast due to the geography of the area and the remoteness, looking specifically at the situation in each community.

The following research questions were proposed by this group, in approximately the following order of priority:

- *Analysis of trust-building mechanisms and models:* What kinds of trust building exercises have worked for coastal communities, and what has not? The Gwaii Trust was suggested as a model to investigate. This analysis should be undertaken through participatory action research involving local people.
- *Analysis of barriers to equal opportunity participation in the economy:* For example, by looking at regulatory and institutional structures and how these create barriers to economic diversification and participation.

- *Analysis of infrastructure investment:* What are the impediments to infrastructure investment on the coast? What have been the successes and failures?
- *Analysis of equitable resource revenue sharing arrangements:* Several participants commented that they “do not just want jobs.” Communities want structural changes that will be retain more benefits in the community for the long-term. This should include an assessment of total government based revenue flows into and out of communities, whether this optimal, and what the alternatives are.
- *Analysis of stumpage:* To determine how the stumpage system creates incentives and disincentives for local value-added processing.
- *Analysis of opportunities for small timber sales:* For example, to create local access to specific species and grades in small volumes through a log market (e.g. Vernon).
- *Community-based impact assessment tools:* The Assessment Team should develop community-usable methodologies for evaluating impacts of new infrastructure investment, as a tool for use by the community over the long-term.
- *Analysis of opportunities for expanding woodlot licenses and community forest licenses.*

This group concluded by stating that all analysis, research and assessment needs to be done in a way that actively builds local capacity and trust.

3.4.4 Investment and Venture Capital

- *Financial capital:* It was noted that financial capital is a necessary ingredient for economic development at any level, although less so than it used to be. There is “no more waiting for the big mine or mill to generate the big income” for communities. There is a need to look at smaller scale enterprises and their capital needs but it is “infinitely more difficult to raise capital for small businesses than big business.” Specialized lenders are needed, tailored to small communities. There needs to be a “diversity of lenders of \$20,000 rather than one lender of \$100,000.”
- *Social investment capital flows:* It was noted that in 1984, social investment was US\$80 billion; by 1989, it had reached US\$639 billion; it is now US\$2.16 trillion. One eighth of all managed money is now social investment. Seventy-nine per cent of investment portfolios are screened for environmental criteria and multiple screening is popular. There are now social capital experts in the U.S. with access to significant money to invest in communities.
- *Clear and simple investment story:* It was noted that to appeal to social investors, the story of what is possible on the coast needs to be kept simple, “we need this much money to ‘buy’ this much land for preservation and this much money for ecosystem-based management.” One participant commented that the uncertainty of land claims makes it difficult to provide a simple story to investors.

This working group proposed the following three guiding questions:

- *What is the money needed for?* For example, roads, transportation networks; data, information, and knowledge acquisition; funding for transition to conservation-

based land use; restoration projects; funding of intermediaries with investment and venture capital community (e.g. Ecotrust); development of institutional infrastructure (e.g. ecological services trading); product development; and, marketing.

- *What do investors need?* For example, stability, credibility, liquidity, value, certainty (and profit!); structure in product development; accountability; a compelling and good story.
- *What is needed by people getting the money?* For example, stability; jobs; management and other systems; a stable playing field; “purchase of rights” (i.e. existing rights might have to be purchased to move to a new conservation-based economic model); control over resources; a transition plan for workers and others; an outline of the economic benefits of value-added.

3.4.5 Summary Comments

Following brief presentations of the results of the working group discussions, Merran Smith gave a summary of what she had heard from the morning discussions. She noted that it was interesting to hear the areas of common ground among different interests represented at the workshop. She commented that once people understand that the Joint Solutions Project is not a decision-making body, people appear more open and willing to generate new ideas. She stated there is a common recognition that the status quo is not acceptable on the coast and that changes in government policy are needed. There is also a recognition that the market pressure has been a catalyst for positive change. There is a circle of involvement and relationship building that needs to keep going forward to “build something that will stick... There is a good story here and there is work to be done to bring investment and interest to the coast.”

3.5 First Panel Discussion: *Moving Forward on the Theme Areas*

In the morning session of November 10th, four panelists were given eight minutes each to provide initial comments on the scope of the themes and proposed research questions.

3.5.1 Presentation: Robert Prescott-Allen

Robert Prescott-Allen commented that the Joint Solutions Project “marks emergence of a genuine constituency for sustainable development on the coast.” He thought that the initiative can only be expected to yield some but not all of the answers in the progress towards sustainable development. He suggested that “one of the most important things for this process to do, is to leave behind a legacy of knowledge - of what works and what leads to good decisions,” so that learning can continue past the end of this initiative. He suggested four specific things that are needed for success:

- *Clear objectives:* It is important to define the essential elements of “well being” of ecosystems and communities. The Principles and Goals in the *Preliminary Ecosystem-Based Framework* do a good job of elaborating clear objectives on the ecological side, however, the human well-being side of the equation is underdeveloped and needs local peoples’ involvement to articulate objectives for these.
- *Meta-database of information:* There needs to be a meta-database of information established that draws on the large body of information that already exists; it is imperative not to repeat this work.
- *An assessment of current conditions:* An assessment is needed to determine where coastal communities are at, and how they can get to the goals articulated in the Principles and Goals. There is a need to do a complete assessment of ecosystems and communities of the region.
- *Permanent point of access for communities:* There needs to be a place to house the assessment data and results as a permanent point of access for communities. The repository of assessment information needs to be located in the communities and should include both traditional knowledge and scientific data.

3.5.2 Presentation: Robert Lee

Robert Lee stated that the Joint Solutions Project was impressive based his experience in the US and “has a good deal of promise to offer lasting solutions for the coast.” He commented that the information and discussion so far in the workshop sounded like “policy drift.” The changes being talked about are significant, including changes in relationships of communities to forests in moving from an industrial to an information age; and, changes in the industrial structure with a downscaling of activity from large, industrial organizations to smaller, information-based organizations. There are also questions being raised about changes in tenure and jurisdictional issues with respect to First Nations. All of these are part of a rapidly changing vision for the coast.

Robert suggested some specific policy analysis research questions that should be addressed:

- *How can decentralization of authority take place?* What policy and legislative changes are needed to bring this about?

- *What political instruments will enhance this political decentralization?* He suggested it would be worthwhile to do case histories of how centralization of control occurred on the coast to shed light on this question.
- *How can self-determination be fostered?* There is a great deal of literature on institutional reform. One of the avenues that should be explored is the key role of First Nations, and the need for a healing process, and a dialogue between communities that could lead to learning and self-empowerment.
- *What strategy could best help the adjustment of local communities, and people outside local communities, who will be affected by change?* He suggested the experience from the U.S. Pacific Northwest shows that urban economies are very different than rural areas. There is a much greater “attachment to place among rural people” and therefore effort has to be directed to ensure these people have options to stay where they are. On the other side, re-training of labour in urban areas goes much more smoothly given more dynamic employment markets. He indicated that there is substantial literature on this topic.

Robert concluded by commending people for taking a leadership role on these issues which he felt was “way of ahead of the dialogue in the U.S.”

3.5.3 Presentation: *Pete Morton*

Pete Morton acknowledged that he was on a “steep learning curve” on coastal issues given his unfamiliarity with coastal BC. He commended people for embracing an ecosystem-based management approach which he characterized as “managing to learn and learning to manage.” He suggested it would be important to develop inventories of non-timber resource values and to put in place proper monitoring systems. As part of ecosystem-based management, people need to clearly understand the impacts of changing management regimes on ecosystems. Both inventory compilation and monitoring can be labour intensive, which would create local jobs. He suggested that the focus of value-added efforts should be on producing high quality saw log timber and noted that it would be very difficult to compete in the fibre market given the comparative disadvantages in ecology, topography and remoteness of the coast compared with other locations. He suggested another option for economic diversification is revenue sharing with the tourism operations already active on the coast, for example, the cruise ship operators.

Pete suggested that telecommunications infrastructure should also be looked into as a potential ‘keystone’ capacity building effort. There is a need for education and training, which would be facilitated by telecommunications infrastructure investments. He also suggested that “web marketing” is also an option, for example for native crafts. A specific research study could examine the cost of up-grading telecommunication infrastructure in coastal communities.

Pete also suggested that there is a need to develop an understanding of the extent of the “sustenance economy” on the coast through surveys. Some quantitative analysis would be

helpful in this respect, using market prices to estimate values. Contingent valuation methods or full cost accounting could be used to determine the extent of this economic activity, although he acknowledged that all these methods would likely underestimate the total value of socio-economic contribution of sustenance harvesting.

3.5.4 Presentation: *William Stanbury*

William Stanbury suggested some specific research and analytical approaches that could be implemented to avoid the existing policy approach of “ready, fire, aim:”

- *Solicitation of preferences:* First, there is a need for a systematic solicitation of preferences of the people in B.C., especially in this region, of the options being proposed and consequences of these options (e.g. reduced cutting rights, higher environmental amenities). This study should assess differences in preferences in terms of the timing of implementation of options and the pace of adjustment. There is also a need to understand how native and non-native people perceive these changes. This solicitation of preferences has to go beyond the local region given the scale of change proposed.
- *Identification and measurement of environmental benefits:* Second, the environmental benefits of options being proposed need to be identified and measured, recognizing the difficulties with measuring non-market benefits, and the trade-offs within the environmental basket. There is a need to clearly understand the alternatives and their impacts: “large economic sacrifices are being asked for, so benefits have to be well articulated, and they have to be sufficiently large to justify the costs.” William suggested that environmental demands to date have been relatively simple: put areas in parks and stop logging old-growth; there is a need for “a more sophisticated arena of analysis, in which we understand the increasing environmental amenities we are getting from sacrifices, and where the returns are diminishing...this is complex analysis.”
- *Structural change in the forest sector:* Third, a study is needed of the major changes that are underway in the forest sector in these regions, in terms of efficiency and their distributional consequences. There is a need to understand the *speed* of adjustment especially, since the psychological impacts are dramatically different depending on the pace of change.
- *Scenarios of aboriginal title settlement:* Fourth, and perhaps most important, there is a need to understand several scenarios of aboriginal title settlement. First Nations have fundamental rights and title that must be respected and acknowledged and it is essential to incorporate into this assessment work some likely scenarios of how settlement might occur.
- *Transition from forestry:* Finally, there is a need to develop options and strategies for making the adjustment from a predominantly forestry-based economy to much less dependency on forestry as the engine of growth in these regional and local economies. Options need to be as practical as possible, and should address the following questions: How will individual organizations respond? What are the responsibilities of local government? Can they act to implement change? What are

the responsibilities of the provincial government? Identifying the players and the actual actions they must take keeps the analysis practical and this is essential.

3.5.5 Plenary Question and Answer Session

The following is a summary of the key issues that were raised in a question and answer session that followed the above presentations:

- *Regional versus provincial priorities:* It was suggested that a provincial-level policy direction can be thwarted by regional autonomy when regional or local people move to undermine it, even when the provincial vision was developed as a ‘grassroots’ exercise. Robert Lee commented that this kind of problem is common with federal forest plans in the U.S. If there are tiered authorities, it is important that regional groups be fully involved in policy development processes that will affect them.
- *Cruise ship ‘head tax’:* The idea of a cruise ship passenger ‘head tax’ was identified as a potentially substantial revenue source. It was noted, however, that the legal authority lies with federal government so one would have to persuade them of the merits of the tax; even when cruise ship docks, it is still within federal jurisdiction. It was suggested that an alternative would be to have travel agents charge this fee, and that the idea may appeal to tour operators interested in promoting their comparative advantage as environmentally-friendly tour operators. It was noted that in Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte Islands, local communities convinced operators to contribute a fee per day to a local development fund. Caution needs to be exercised, however, as First Nations are looking at this option also, and believe they have unresolved rights with respect to waterways.
- *Monitoring systems:* A question was posed as to how one would design a monitoring system that is relevant at the local regional level and that goes beyond traditional indicators. Robert Prescott-Allen responded that there are established ways for communities to do self-assessment; to develop their own understanding of what makes a healthy community and ecosystem; and, how well along they are in reaching goals. He could direct people to those tools.
- *Costs versus benefits:* One participant questioned whether the costs associated with reducing the AAC are greater than benefits, given how it will affect forest workers and First Nations people. It was noted that with implementation of “Option 9” of the Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team in the U.S. Pacific Northwest, the pain and dislocation was misrepresented and was greater than reported by some studies.

Robert Lee noted that there are differences between the B.C. coast and the U.S. Pacific Northwest where one-third of the logging on federal land was done by small scale loggers, in contrast to B.C. where most of the harvest is by large forest companies. As a result, the impact in the U.S. was greatest on small operators and there was no attempt to mitigate that impact, which was in effect a “cultural assault on rural workers to change their ways.” US\$30-40 billion in assets was transferred from those who had small mills to those who benefited from the higher timber prices

produced by subsequent timber scarcity, mostly larger companies with private holdings. The result was “fantastic windfall profits for some and billions of dollars worth of wealth transfers.” The ENGO community also benefited from the re-assignment of rights. Robert stressed that the difference in B.C. is that there is not the rural entrepreneurial culture that existed in the U.S; most workers live outside the regional area, and are not local residents so the impacts will be different. And, there appears to be more of an emphasis in this process not to displace local workers but to revitalize local economies.

Robert Prescott-Allen added that it is essential to know the trade-offs associated with various options, however, cost-benefit analysis is a “mine field” as there are grave difficulties in measuring non-monetary benefits and costs. Some variables would have to be measured in physical terms, not imputed as dollar values. He cautioned that it is “extremely dangerous” to do strictly monetary cost-benefit analysis. William Stanbury suggested that it is possible to calculate the imputed value of some non-monetary benefits (for example the private sector cost of extending lifespans), but the main thing is to measure environmental benefits so that they are known, in whatever physical terms they can be measured in.

- *Integrating native spirituality with science:* One First Nations participant commented that First Nations do not want to be assimilated into the “linear, rational and intellectual” ways of western economics and science, that “what needs to be contemplated is a real coming together of the academic community with the aboriginal community; if we fail to integrate the spirit of the native people with science, we will be faced with ecological collapse.” It was suggested that what needs happen is for everyone on the coast to get past “cultural polarization” and find mechanisms for “all of us to become native, to become colour blind.” Some First Nations people are receiving signs that ecological collapse is imminent if things continue the way they are; if “our actions continue to be based on fear and hatred rather than guided by love and understanding.”
- Robert Prescott-Allen responded that he strongly agreed that we should abandon labels and that personally he found it easier to “understand the universe as an emotional truth rather than a rationale way,” but reasoned thought is the way most people are comfortable communicating with each other. Robert Lee added that scientists are guided by curiosity, but over time this curiosity has become controlled by large enterprises especially government through the institutions of learning. He felt that it was unfortunate that science has become a “language of control.” He added that there is need for language “that is empowering for all of us” and that the power of a workshop like this is that “we can move to a place of power sharing.”
- *Linkages between structural change and market forces in the forest industry:* Linda Coady commented that with the coastal forest industry, there is an expectation that many of the mills on the coast might not be open in 6 months or 18 months from now as a result of substantial structural changes that are underway within the industry. Yet, these changes are not linked to the market and societal changes that are putting downward pressure on fibre supply. She posed the question of how these can be linked.

Robert Lee responded with the example of the U.S. steel industry which was in crisis a few years ago. Structural changes resulted in the major steel mills declining and being replaced by value-added niche players who targeted high value markets. He suggested that similar changes could occur in forestry, by looking at what can be done to add value to standing trees. Structural change and reinvestment in the forest sector could result in “faster growth of higher value trees on a smaller land base, generating more value, jobs, income and taxes.” Currently, large volume producers dominate the industry which is a serious structural problem. There needs to be a comprehensive review of how to add value.

William Stanbury added that tenure reform is one avenue to address these issues. There has been quite a bit of movement in growing the small business sector over the past 10 years to about 13% of the provincial AAC now. Nonetheless, the AAC is fully allocated and now a “negative sum game”; any re-allocation has got to come from the already shrinking harvesting volume of the major companies. However, he suggested that there are tenures that are not being fully utilized and could be to ensure that there is active forestry. He also suggested that greater and more secure rights over a smaller forest land base may be a solution, and there needs to be experimentation - not wholesale change - to assess these alternatives. He suggested that governments are generally “very bad at experimenting with small scale change and implementation; rather they go for massive policy change usually with egregious results.”

3.6 Second Panel Discussion: *Moving Forward on the Theme Areas*

The following is a brief summary of the major points raised by four additional panelists.

3.6.1 Presentation: *Tom Power*

Tom Power focused his presentation on the types of socioeconomic analyses that are needed to help people make decisions on forest management. He argued that traditional socioeconomic analysis often contains little in the way of “social” analysis; it often has a very narrow, quantitative focus on monetary economic issues resulting in projections of “huge negative impacts.” Typically, these analyses are generated by “desk-top models based on a caricature of the economy” as a static entity, with little if any ability to self-adjust for change. As a result, the economy is seen as a “largely non-adjusting, state-managed caricature that does not match reality.” In terms of meaningful socioeconomic analysis, Tom suggested the following:

- First, there is a need to look at whole systems and account for the self-adjusting capacity of economies. This is largely carried out by individuals and private enterprise. He suggested it is crucial that the self-adjusting capacities of communities be accounted for in making projections. It is important to keep track of meaningful divisions in the economy, not assuming a simplistic linkage of cause and

effect. For example, the structural change in the industry that is causing income and job loss in the forest sector needs to be distinguished from the impacts of conservation.

- Second, it is very important to distinguish different geographic economies, recognizing that many rural people are “committed to economies of place.” The workforce dynamic in rural areas is thus very different than in urban areas where there is more willingness and capacity for workers to relocate. It is therefore very important to take into account the appropriate planning, and assistance needed in specific sectors and communities.

Tom highlighted the fact that more of the economy has become “footloose” as a result of the increasing importance of knowledge-based, rather than resource-based enterprises. Increasingly, “the basic attractiveness of communities and landscapes is going to be an increasing important factor in determining the location of economic enterprise.” Environment protection should not, therefore, be seen only as a cost, but a benefit that can create long term competitive advantage in the new economy. He stressed that “there should be confidence that we live in highly adaptive, fluid economies - not primarily driven by government decisions, but those of individuals acting on individual preferences...it would be a terrible mistake to ignore the example of other communities and their successful adaptation to a changing economic base.”

3.6.2 Presentation: *David Berge*

David Berge highlighted several challenges to attracting financial capital to the coast:

- First, foundations and investors need a simple story that is compelling for them. The Joint Solutions Project is certainly a compelling story but it is not simple. In fact, it is quite complex which makes investors nervous. There is a need to manage the communication with these interests so that they can remain focused on a positive outcome. Foundations and social investors want to be “heroes”: they do not want to be the first money in; they want to be the last, when the goal is in sight. They want to see local monies raised and agreements in place, so that their contribution can push the issue over the top. The challenge then is packaging the issue in a way that will attract and make maximum use of foundations and social investor’s funds.
- Second, in order to attract capital and develop capacity, there needs to be a certain amount of infrastructure. But to build the infrastructure, there needs to be a certain amount of capital. This creates a kind of “Catch 22” for small communities with a minimal base of resources and capacity in the first place.
- Third, every one has a difference view if the reality on the coast, which makes it difficult to create investment opportunities in which there is commonality of agreement on the desired outcome. Depending on one’s view of reality, investment capital will be applied very differently by different interests.

David concluded by noting that more and people “want to support their values with their money” so there are real opportunities to attract social investment to the coast. He

stressed, however, that “clarity of vision is crucial so that your message is clear” and can get through to a social investment audience that is inundated with more and more proposals each year. Simple, compelling stories work the best. Once the investment money is committed, then the challenge is to invest in community enterprises that will “cycle the money through the community a couple of times” to create the most local benefit.

3.6.3 Presentation: *Roslyn Kunin*

Roslyn Kunin noted that in her experience of studying coastal economies for the past 30 years, she has never seen such a sharp distinction between rural and urban economies. The urban economy is doing reasonably well but is “far more divorced from the rural economy than it has ever been before.” The economic cycles of the primary economy are no longer felt in the metropolitan areas of the lower mainland and southern Vancouver Island. The non-metropolitan economy is, however, “hurting very, very badly and Vancouver is simply not feeling it.”

She noted that there are acute and basic concerns about the ability of many rural communities to retain jobs and income. In many coastal communities, the job base is “disappearing - mining, forestry, and fishing are in serious decline across the board.” She noted that several communities in the Central and North Coast have essentially no means of economic support. Outside of metropolitan B.C. “there is no job base for displaced workers to go to.” The only economic asset that many rural people have is their homes, which have lost much of their value along with the decline in the rural economy.

She stressed that the focus in many rural communities is on the basic needs of food and housing and “many people would look for any means to provide economic opportunity.” She felt that the solution to these socio-economic problems in rural areas may be to focus on “a thousands points of light” and encouraging small scale diverse enterprises, and micro-innovation. Roslyn also suggested:

- Incorporating sustainable development indicators into the assessment work for the coast, in an effort to have clearer goals and performance benchmarks. She cited a Statistics Canada definition of sustainable economic development as “social, economic and environmental indicators all moving in a positive direction.”
- Using cost-benefit analysis, despite its short-comings. She felt that it is important to be as “explicit as possible and be open to others applying their assumptions and data” to the model.
- Focusing attention on developing human resource skills of the people in the communities. “Give people the hope, the optimism, the vision, as well as the technical skills and training they need.”

Roslyn concluded by stating that economic self-determination is the key issue for many regional communities and that the Joint Solutions Project should be looking at “many

smaller changes that can be made in place. Geography is not destiny - with technology you can now do things in Hartley Bay that you could never have done 10 years ago.”

3.6.4 Plenary Question and Answer Session

The following is a summary of the key issues that were raised in a question and answer session that followed the above presentations:

- *Cost-benefit analysis:* The question was posed that if Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) is being recommended as a tool that should be used in assessment work, how can it be made useful in addressing a whole range of intangible values and trade-offs, such as salmon and bear population numbers and impacts on eco-tourism and so on? William Stanbury responded that a tourism CBA analysis can easily be done, given data on fish, bears, tourism revenue generation, and so on. Roslyn Kunin agreed that given data CBA can be done, but the more important issue is for an appropriate group to decide what the questions are that the CBA is examining, and the scope of the analysis (for example, whether the impact being assessed is a single tourism operation or a the sector within the region). Tom Power cautioned that the problem can be very complex since scientists often do not agree on the nature of underlying ecological relationships so economists cannot work with reliable information. In fact, it is probably not wise to try and be precise; it may be more important to learn how to make good decisions in the absence of certainty. Pete Morton added that the choice of discount rate used in CBA is a crucial decision. Any positive discount rate is in effect discounting future generations which is not consistent with sustainable development. Other options are to use minimum safe standards, or even negative discount rates.

Tom Power clarified that CBA is not the same thing as “impact analysis,” at least in a U.S. context. CBA looks at costs and benefits from an economic efficiency point of view, ignoring the distributional consequences of these costs and benefits. Impact analysis, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with the distributional consequences of specific events within a geographic area and on specific interests.

- *Lessons from the U.S. Pacific Northwest experience:* Tom Power noted that the severity of job loss impacts in Pacific Northwest forestry-dependent communities was a function of their dependency on this one industry. Communities which existed solely for forestry jobs, or were heavily dependent on the forest sector fared the worst. Other towns, with more diversity in economic activity digested the changes and have experienced renewed vitality. In undertaking socioeconomic analyses, Tom stressed that a distinction needs be made between isolated communities with little in the way of economic diversity versus communities a more diverse economy to absorb the impact.
- *Identifying keystone capacity building:* One participant asked if there is a way to identify the keystone events that contribute to social capital in a community. Examples were given of the reduction in suicide rates in several communities resulting from introduction of a ferry service, construction of a school, and a health

centre. Tom Power suggested that a “commitment to place” can take two forms. In one instance, people can feel trapped, which can lead to all kinds of pathology and social trauma from trapped populations. The turnaround is when people make choices to live somewhere because they have options. They then invest their energy and enthusiasm into creating a positive sense of place.

- *Empowering communities:* One participant noted that analyses can be just “cold hard facts” and asked how this work be done in a way that is empowering for communities. Roslyn Kunin suggested that the key is to use simple direct language, to tell a story, make it understandable to all, and make sure the information is well distributed to people in the community. Then local people have got to take the information and analysis and begin to help themselves. Robert Lee added that the loss of a job is a traumatic event for an individual, and can lead to widespread personal and family trauma that may take many years to unfold. These issues need to be dealt with very sensitively in working with communities.
- *Common baseline:* It was noted that there needs to be a common understanding and agreement on the socioeconomic baseline if there is ever to be agreement on solutions.
- *Philanthropic versus social investment capital:* It was noted that communities should utilize philanthropic capital – since philanthropists are more likely to understand and appreciate the complexity of the coast situation – as the initial risk capital, to then attract the more conservative social investment capital which is willing to accept a modest rate of return.

3.7 Plenary Discussion: Assessment Team Priorities, Projects and Deliverables

The following is a summary of a plenary discussion in which workshop participants were asked to address the following questions: What are priorities for the assessment team to consider? And, What are some specific deliverables and projects?

- *Proposed structure and composition of the Assessment Team:* Keith Moore clarified that he is working on contract to the Joint Solutions Project sponsors to create a structure for the proposed Assessment Team (described in more detail in materials distributed at the workshop). He reiterated that the concept is to bring together people with local expertise and knowledge with specialists with a range of scientific backgrounds to work together in developing analyses and providing advice and recommendations to decision-makers (e.g. First Nations, provincial government and land use planning processes). He acknowledged that there needs to be broad endorsement from First Nations and local communities and perhaps a committee should be put together to engage those groups. Keith strongly recommended that the majority of the members of the assessment team be Canadian citizens, but acknowledged that a lot could be learned from international experts. It was noted that that whoever is chosen for the team, “they should spend time in those communities to understand the essence of the dilemma they face.”

- *Importance of community involvement:* It was noted that this initiative must start from the community, and acknowledge the two different societies that exist on the coast. Above all, it must not be a “top-down” process.
- *Practical tools:* The need for practical tools for identifying economic opportunities and ways to take advantage of them was stressed, particularly for First Nations and local communities. One participant added that people should not have unreasonable expectations about how fast change can occur: “we should develop tools quickly but move slowly.”
- *A Three Plan proposal:* William Stanbury recommended that the assessment team address the following three priorities over the next 6 months:
 - An eco-forestry plan should be developed for the two regions that outlines a series of ecological options;
 - A new economy plan should be developed that address the decline in forestry activity and helps to deal with the drop in employment , where those losses will occur, and how to mitigate these impacts; and,
 - a land claims plan needs to be developed that outlines the scenarios that might occur through treaty settlement. Developing this plan is a matter of respect for First Nations and a recognition of the constraints that exist on this process.
- *Active assessment:* Robert Prescott-Allen urged that the socioeconomic studies and analyses not be done in the traditional way as one-off studies, but framed in terms of an assessment that will lead to adaptive learning: “the assessment should provide a framework, indicators and a monitoring system that will enable us to reinvent, reinvent and reinvent.”
- *Financial resources in support of the Joint Solutions Project:* One participant asked what kind of money can be expected to be raised from philanthropists and investors to pay for the Joint Solutions Project. Linda Coady responded that no one thought this initiative would be cheap but many people felt that it would be better than the next alternative. She indicated that the money would come from government, companies, investors and other sources. She clarified that the cost of the assessment work being proposed could be \$3-4 million. Implementation of options that would deal equitably with existing entitlements and First Nations could be around \$100-200 million. Those involved in sponsoring the initiative feel that if options are developed that would meet with local and international acceptance, then it should be possible to raise this amount of money.
- *Importance of the research process* One participant commented that the essential thing, along with being inclusive of all interests involved, is to have a collaborative research process established between the community development interests and the researchers. Local practitioners will need to engage with researchers to frame the appropriate questions, rather than trying to establish priorities in advance: “if we want to brainstorm deliverables fine; but defining the nature of the problem has to be done collaboratively through participatory action research.”

3.8 Concluding Remarks: *Sam Moody and Patricia McKim*

Sam Moody, Economic Development Officer for the Nuxalk First Nation, and Patricia McKim, Economic Development Officer for the Central Coast Regional District, provided their concluding remarks at the end of the workshop.

Patricia McKim reminded people that in 1995, \$19 million was collected and remitted to the provincial government in property taxes from the Central Coast Regional District (CCRD), yet only \$220,000 in revenues were returned to the community. She commented that the discussion over the past day of the millions of dollars that might come to the coast are alarming in the context of the economic realities there. She said that she came to this workshop with a mandate not to be supportive, but found that people were thoughtful and concerned about the people of the coast, and she thanked everyone for this demonstration of commitment. She especially acknowledged Roslyn Kunin's contribution and her "common sense approach to our communities." She stated that she has still supports the Central Coast Land and Coastal Resource Management planning process. She wished everyone well and thanked them for their honest and considerate discussions over the past two days.

Sam Moody said that he looked forward to being invited and appreciated attending the workshop. He stated that his community is going through some very emotional exchanges with the logging industry: some of the people want to see the logging continue; others want to see the forests saved. In the Nuxalk community, family relations are sacred and highly valued. The rift between families over these issues over the past 5 years of this turmoil has started to have an effect on the Nuxalk community, and a result, they have embarked on a community healing process to heal the wounds. He stated that his own healing process started 10 years ago at which time he committed to start talking about truth, and part of that truth is that "unless we can come together as a community, we won't survive this change." Sam reminded people that trust is a big issue for First Nations given the history of how they have been treated.

Sam said that one of his major interests is in value-added, in using the skills of First Nations artists to create niche markets. This kind of process should help to provide the technical expertise needed to produce products for markets around the world and to create jobs in the community. "The most important thing is an equitable distribution to more people than just a few."

3.9 Closing Comments: *Merran Smith and Linda Coady*

Merran Smith made her concluding comments of the workshop by acknowledging that this whole process involves risks for all those involved. She felt that over the past two days people were expressing a willingness to move forward, to "find a way to reduce the hurt...and develop a willingness to accept and embrace the change." She gave the analogy of learning to sing, and the discovery that learning to sing is "not about singing but about listening; hearing the diversity so you can sing in harmony."

Merran touched on two key ideas from the workshop: the need to empower communities with tools and resources and enable the “thousands points of light” to happen; and, the potential to attract investment capital to the coast if people can get past the conflicts and tell a simple and compelling story of their collective hope for the future. She concluded by reminding people of the beauty of the Central and North Coast and the special people who live there: “If we can’t make change work here, then where on the planet can we do it? We have the strength of the place to help us really see it through.”

Linda Coady concluded by thanking everyone who helped to put the workshop together, and especially acknowledged the First Nations and those who traveled from the coast and gave legitimacy to these discussions. She reminded everyone that the purpose of the Joint Solutions Project is to put together options and ideas to deal with the complexities of community stability, ecological sustainability and economic diversification in the Central and North Coast.

She also noted that the forest companies and ENGOs sponsoring this initiative are involved in active discussions with communities, First Nations, and contractors about a management structure that would be inclusive of all interests. She outlined some of the next steps, including: tightening up the socioeconomic principles; elaborating on a transition plan and a protocol for dealing with equity issues; and, designing a structure for the assessment team. She stated that the Joint Solutions Project sponsors hope to have outcomes from all of this before the next provincial election.

Linda touched on the fears that exist about this process: there is the fear that the costs of resolving this conflict will be too high and inequitable. Equally, there is the fear that the costs of *not* resolving this conflict have been, and will continue to be, too high. And then there is the fear that this conflict is perhaps unresolvable. She felt that the best way to deal with these fears is to get a vision out there that people can see and be part of.

A participant added a final comment that people should be hopeful about the prospects for this initiative. His involvement in the Kamloops LRMP convinced him that “there is nothing like the success that these things can produce; all interests benefit; everybody gets some ownership in the problem-solving process and the benefits of the outcomes resolved.” He felt that there was the capability in this room and in the communities to “grab the brass ring.”

APPENDIX 1: DISCUSSION POINTS FOR NOVEMBER WORKSHOP

The November workshop is an early step on the way to developing a research and analysis program that will contribute tools, strategies, and data to efforts to design conservation-based economic development strategies for the Central and North Coasts of BC. The themes listed below are intended to provide structure for discussion at the November workshop, highlighting key areas that emerged from a preliminary scoping session on October 5th attended by representatives of the CFCI companies, the environmental groups and invited economic development professionals from or familiar with the Central and North Coast region. Key questions (numbered) and potential project ideas (bullets) are also identified, but they are intended primarily to inspire discussion rather than seek direct answers or consideration.

Conservation-based economy:

One of the goals of the initiative is to link ecosystem-based planning with economic assessments and new opportunities for diversification. This will produce a range of realistic options for sound land use planning in the region that will benefit the environment and the economy.

1. What are the most appropriate ways to link ecological options with associated economic impacts and opportunities?
2. What is the full range of benefits people gain from the environment? On what basis do we compare options? What are most acceptable methods of valuation?
 - Develop a full cost accounting framework for assessing competing demands.
 - Identify existing and new opportunities to benefit from conservation.
3. How can we foster sustainable economic development that focuses on quality and adding value to resources rather than relying on volume?

Capacity Building:

As the region evolves and develops, there is a need to ensure there is capacity for local individuals and organizations to take on the various opportunities and challenges that will face them.

1. What is the current level of capacity in the region? Where do specific needs lie in the region and in communities?
 - Develop self-assessment tools.
2. How do we turn commercial ideas into commercial opportunities?
 - Explore potential for enterprise incubators.
 - Explore potential for business service co-ops.
 - Develop regional marketing strategies (e.g., tourism, non-timber forest products, value-added products, First Nations art).
3. How do we ensure imported expertise 'sticks' after experts leave?
 - Develop capacity-building protocols.
4. What are some First Nations-specific strategies for capacity building?

Community and Regional Economic Self-Determination

A priority for resource-dependent communities is to take greater control over the factors that affect their economic sustainability. This requires first a greater understanding of their own economy, past and present, which forms a basis for developing strategies to provide opportunities to use or process local resources locally, and to expand local and regional control of resource planning and management to ensure that local requirements and values are being met.

1. How can communities get an accurate assessment of their current situation, including their 'hidden' or sustenance economy?
 - Conduct economic, social and environmental wealth inventories.
 - Develop tools for self-assessment.
 - Develop tools to measure the value of environmental assets and to evaluate development options.
 - Survey what capital and commercial assets already exist and their condition.
 - Undertake trend analysis to better understand larger scale forces that affect local and regional; economies.
 - Documenting and correcting "leakages" to ensure wealth from the region is re- retained in communities.
2. How can communities gain more control over the environmental resources that are necessary or important for their social and economic well-being?
 - Explore tenure agreement designs for timber and non-timber forest products.
 - Impact Benefit Agreements: could these be useful models for insuring maximum local benefits from development?
 - Conduct an inventory of assets and competitive advantages in external markets.
3. How can communities encourage greater local processing of timber resources?
 - Explore advantages and opportunities for log markets.
 - Explore advantages and opportunities for processing co-ops.
 - Develop a regional value-added marketing strategy.
4. What are the key infrastructure needs that may be an impediment to local economic development?
 - Conduct strategic assessment of current infrastructure, documenting how deficiencies affect local and regional economic sustainability
 - Assess potential impact of new infrastructure investments.

Investment and Venture Capital:

There is a need for investment capital that is willing to either wait several years to realize returns or to gain 'returns' in other ways, such as through the achievement of more philanthropic objectives (e.g., environmentally sound community development). These funds exist: the challenge is how to attract them to this region and how to deploy them in the most beneficial manner.

1. What are the most efficient ways to give both the investor and the recipient what they need?

- Develop investment vehicles.
 - Explore potential models for communities to maintain some influence over local investment priorities: Gwaii Trust, Columbia Basin Trust, Cariboo Economic Action Forum, Manitoba Rural Adaptation Council.
2. How do we measure social, environmental and economic well-being?
 - Develop measurable criteria and filters.
 3. How do communities obtain an accurate and realistic assessment of opportunities to guide funding priorities?

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Morris Amos

Director of Natural Resources
Haisla Nations
260 Kitlope Street
Kitamaat Village, BC
Phone: 250-639-9361
Fax: 250-632-4794

Brenda Armstrong

Moresby Consulting
3259 Telescope Terrace
Nanaimo, BC V9T 3V4
Phone: 250-758-8434
Fax: 250-758-4075
E-mail: barmstro@mail.island.net

Bill Beldessi

Electoral Area "E" Director
Skeena-Queen Charlotte Regional District
Box 482
Sandspit, BC V0T 1T0
Phone: 250-637-2226
Fax: 250-637-5625
E-mail: beldessi@island.net

John Block

Green Economy Secretariat
PO Box 9409 Stn. Prov. Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9V1
Phone: 250-387-2519
Fax: 250-387-1951
E-mail: john.block@gems6.gov.bc.ca

Andrew Andy

Central Coastal LCRMP
Liaison Coordinator, Nuxalk Nation
Box 65
Bella Coola, BC V0T 1C0
Phone: 250-799-0048
Fax: 250-799-0046
E-mail: andy@belco.bc.ca

Paul Bavis

Manager, Timber Supply and Planning
Western Forest Products
Suite 2300-1111 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V6E 4M3
Phone: 604-665-6222
Fax: 604-665-6268
E-mail: pbavis@westernforest.com

David Berge

President, Underdog Ventures
84 Oak Street
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301 USA
Phone: 802-254-2003
Fax: 802-254-4645
E-mail: david@underdogventures.com

Randy Bouchard, Ph.D.

Director
BC Indigenous Languages Project
171 Bushby Street
Victoria, BC V8S 1B5
Phone: 250-384-4544
Fax: 250-384-2502
E-mail: bcilp@islandnet.com

R.W. (Bob) Brough
Timberlands Manager
Port McNeill Timberlands, Weyerhaeuser
PO Box 5000, 400 Southwest Main
Port McNeill, BC V0N 2R0
Phone: 250-956-5220
Fax: 250-956-5230
E-mail: rw.brough@mbltd.com

Linda Coady
Vice President, Environmental Enterprise
Weyerhaeuser Co. Ltd.
925 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 3L2
Phone: 604-661-8169
Fax: 604-661-8507
E-mail: linda.coady@weyerhaeuser.com

Ralph Dick
Chief
We Wai Kai First Nation (Cape Mudge)
1441 Old Island Hwy
Campbell River, BC V9W 2E4
Phone: 250-287-9460
Fax: 250-287-9469

Sarah Fraser
Assistant
Coast Forest Conservation Initiative
c/o Western Forest Products
Suite 2300 – 1111 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V6E 4M3
Phone: 604-665-6211
E-mail: Sfraser@westernforest.com

Gary Bull, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Forest Resources Management, UBC
2nd Floor, Forest Services Centre
2045, 2424 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4
Phone: 604-822-1553, Fax: 604-822-9106
E-mail: garybull@interchange.ubc.ca

Norman Dale
Senior Planner
Oweekeno~Kitasoo~Nuxalk Tribal
Council
Box 760, Nuxalk Traditional Territory
Bella Coola, BC V0T 1C0
Phone: 250-799-5448
Fax: 250-799-5779
E-mail: ndale@uniserve.com

Rupert Downing
Executive Director
Intergovernment Relations & Strategic Init.
Ministry of Community Development
204 Market Square - 560 Johnson St.
Victoria BC V8W 9R1
Phone: 250-387-2910
Fax: 250-356-6417
E-mail: Rupert.Downing@gems1.gov.bc.ca

Bob Friesen
Friesen Rea & Company
1911 Lulie Street
Victoria, BC V8R 5W9
Phone: 250-598-2366
Fax: 250-598-2415
E-mail: bobfriesen@home.com

Howard Green

Deputy Chief Councilor
Lax Kw'Alaams
206 Shashaak Street
Lax Kw'Alaams, BC V0V 1H0
Phone: 250-625-3293
Fax: 250-625-3246

James Hackett

Sr. Consultant
DR Systems Incorporated
1615 Bowen Road
Nanaimo, BC V9S 1G5
Phone: 250-755-3041
Fax: 250-755-2063
E-mail: jhackett@islandnet.com

Keith Hamilton

Bella Bella Community Develop. Society
Heiltsuk Tribal Council
P.O. Box 880
Waglisla, BC
Phone: 250-957-2381
Fax: 250-957-2544
E-mail: khamilton@heiltsuk.com

Robin June Hood, Ph.D.

Blue Heron Global Education Services
123 Howe Street
Victoria, BC V8V 4K5
Phone: 250-384-1437
E-mail: rhood@uvic.ca

Alex Grzybowski

Alex Grzybowski & Associates Ltd.
515 Norris Road
Sidney, BC V8L 5M8
Phone: 250-656-1317
Fax: 250-656-1357
E-mail: grzybowski@tnet.net

Gary Hall

Chief
Kitasoo/Xaisxais
Klemtu, BC V0T 1L0
Phone: 250-839-1294
Fax: 250-839-1256
E-mail: garyhall@kitasoo.org

Jody Holmes, Ph.D.

Science Coordinator
Sierra Club of BC
PO Box 2587
Smithers, BC V0J 2N0
Phone: 250-847-6194
Fax: 250-877-7711
E-mail: jody@sierraclubbc.org

Rick Jeffery

Truck Loggers Association
Suite 725-815 W. Hastings Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 1B4
Phone: 604-684-4291/250-474-7953
Fax: 604-684-7134
E-mail: rick.jeffery@telus.net

Frank Johnson

Chief Councilor
Oweekeno
Bag 3500
Port Hardy, BC V0N 2P0
Phone: 250-949-8625
Fax: 250-949-7105

Victor Kelly

Councilor
Lax Kw'Alaams
206 Shashaak Street
Lax Kw'Alaams, BC V0V 1H0
Phone: 250-625-3293
Fax: 250-625-3246

Emina Krcmar, Ph.D.

Senior Research Associate
Forest Economics and Policy Analysis
(FEPA) Research Unit, UBC
2424 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4
Phone: 604-822-8949
Fax: 604-822-6970
E-mail: ekrcmar@interchange.ubc.ca

Roslyn Kunin, Ph.D.

President, Roslyn Kunin & Associates Inc.
Executive Director, Laurier Institution
3449 West 23rd Avenue
Vancouver, BC, V6S 1K2
Phone: 604-736 0783
Fax: 604-736 0789
E-mail: rkunin@rkunin.com

Daniel Johnston

Arbitrators and Mediators
Hope Johnston and Associates
2871 Barnes Road
Cedar, BC V9R 5K2
Phone: 250-722-2855
Fax: 250-722-2892
E-mail: danieljohnston@telus.net

Dorothy Kennedy, Ph.D.

Anthropologist
Director, BCILP
171 Bushby Street
Victoria, BC V8S 1B5
Phone: 250-384-4544
Fax: 250-384-2502
E-mail: bcilp@islandnet.com

Kevin Kriese

Planning Manager, North Coast
Land Use Coordination Office
Bag 5000
Smithers, BC V0J 2N0
Phone: 250-847-7546
Fax: 250-847-7218
E-mail: kevin.kriese@gems8.gov.bc.ca

Corby Lamb

Area Manager
Western Forest Products
Suite 118 – 1334 Island Highway
Campbell River, BC V9W 8L9
Phone: 250-286-4122
Fax: 250-286-4155
E-mail: clamb@westernforest.com

David Lane

Executive Director
T. Buck Suzuki Environmental Foundation
Phone: 604-255-8819
Fax: 604-255-3162
E-mail: bucksuzuki@ufawu.org

Robert G. Lee, Ph.D.

Professor and Associate Dean for
Organizational Infrastructure
College of Forest Resources
University of Washington
P.O. Box 352100
Seattle, Washington 98195 USA
Phone: 206-685-0879
Fax: 206-685-3091
E-mail: boblee@u.washington.edu

Ted Lewis

Councilor
Cape Mudge Band
PO Box 220
Quathiaski Cove, BC V0P 1N0
Phone: 250-285-3316
Fax: 250-285-2400

Ralph Matthews, Ph.D.

Professor of Sociology,
Dep't of Anthropology and Sociology
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1
Phone: 604-822-4386
Fax: 604-822-6161
E-mail: ralphm@interchange.ubc.ca

Alvin Leask Jr.

Box 972
Prince Rupert, BC V8J 4B7
Phone: 250-628-3135

Mike Lewis

Executive Director
Center for Community Enterprise
Site 142, C-14
Port Alberni, BC V9Y 7L5
Phone: 250-723-1139
Fax: 250-723-3730
E-mail: ccelewis@island.net

Whitney Lukuku

Haisla Forester
Haisla Nations
260 Kitlope Street
Kitamaat Village, BC
Phone: 250-632-4638
Fax: 250-632-4794
E-mail: haisla@sno.net

Sean Markey

Researcher
Simon Fraser University
CED Centre
Burnaby, BC
Phone: 604-291-3972
Fax: 604-291-5473
E-mail: spmarkey@sfu.ca

Patricia McKim

Economic Development Officer
Central Coast Regional District
Bella Coola, BC
Phone: 250-982-2598
E-mail: pmckim@belco.bc.ca

Ross McMillan

President
Boreray Praxis Consulting Inc.
Box 212
Tofino, BC V0R 2Z0
Phone: 250-725-2285
Fax: 250-725-2286
E-mail: praxis@island.net

Keith Moore

PO Box 1029
Queen Charlotte City, BC V0T 1S0
Phone: 250-559-4761
Fax: 250-559-8563
E-mail: kmoore@qcislands.net

Heather Myers, Ph.D.

Asst. Professor, International Studies
Program,
University of Northern British Columbia
3333 University Way
Prince George, BC V2N 4Z9
Phone: 250-960-6481
Fax: 250-960-5544
E-mail: myers@unbc.ca

Dick McMaster

Tourism Visions Consulting
Consulting Assist. to General Manager;
Guide Outfitters Association of BC
1277 Gibraltar Wynd
Kamloops, BC V2C 1S6
Phone: 250-828-1553
Fax: 250-828-1586
E-mail: tourvis@sageserve.com

Sam Moody

Economic Development Office
Nuxalk Nation
Bella Coola, BC
Phone: 250-799-5400
Fax: 250-799-5779
E-mail: capacity@belco.bc.ca

Pete Morton, Ph.D.

Resource Economist
The Wilderness Society
7475 Dakin St. #410
Denver, CO 80221
E-mail: pete_morton@twis.org

Mark Perdue

Western Forest Products
Suite 2300-1111 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V6E 4M3
Phone: 604-665-8838
Fax: 604-665-6268
E-mail: mperdue@westernforest.com

Kim Pollock

IWA Canada
Suite 500-1285 W. Pender Street
Vancouver, BC V6E 4B2
Phone: 604-683-1117
Fax: 604-688-6416
E-mail: kpollcock@iwa.ca

James Pratt

Principal
James Pratt Consulting
541 Cornwall Street
Victoria, BC V8V 4K9
Phone/Fax: 250-920-7826
E-mail: jpratt@pacificcoast.net

R. Stan Price

Strategic Planner
Port McNeill Division, Weyerhaeuser
Box 5000
Port McNeill, BC V0N 2R0
Phone: 250-956-5222
Fax: 250-956-5230
E-mail: stan.price@weyerhaeuser.com

Richard Russ

Skidegate Band Council
PO Box 1301
Skidegate, BC V0T 1S1
Phone: 250-559-4496
Fax: 250-559-8247
E-mail: doris@qcsisland.net

Tom Power, Ph.D.

Economics Department, University of
Montana
Missoula, MT 59812 USA
Phone: 406-243-4586
E-mail: tmpower@selway.umt.edu

Robert Prescott-Allen

PADATA
627 Aquarius Road
Victoria, BC V9C 4G5
Phone: 250-474-1904
Fax: 250-474-6976
E-mail: rpa@padata.com

Erminio Pucci

Erminio Pucci & Associates
P.O. Box 1184
Prince Rupert, BC V8J 4H6
Phone/Fax: 250-627-8696
E-mail: pucci@citytel.net

Clifford Ryan

PO Box 385
Prince Rupert, BC V8J 3P9
Phone: 250-628-3132

David Seymour

Funding Services Officer
(Mid Coast area)
Department of Indian and Northern
Affairs Canada
300 - 1550 Alberni street
Vancouver, BC V6G 3C5
Phone: 604-666-0866
Fax: 604-666-2046
E-mail: seymourd@inac.gc.ca

Deborah Somerville

Manager, Corporate Communications
Norske Skog Canada
9th Floor – 700 W. Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V7Y 1J7
Phone: 604-654-4933
Fax: 604-654-4961
E-mail: deborah.somerville@norske-skog.bc.ca

John Smith

Chief Councilor
Tlowitsis
1398 Caramel Crescent
Campbell River, BC V9W 7Y8
Phone: 250-923-6728
Fax: 250-923-6192

William Stanbury, Ph.D.

Faculty of Commerce
University of British Columbia
2053 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2
Phone: 604-822-8486
E-mail: standbury@commerce.ubc.ca

W. (Bill) Shephard

Chair, Mount Waddington Regional
District
Chair, Mount Waddington Community
Resource Board
Box 1059
Port McNeill, BC V0N 2R0
Phone: 250-956-4709
Fax: 250-956-8232
E-mail: jwshck@capescott.net

Merran Smith

Forest Campaigner
Sierra Club of BC
PO Box 157
Smithers, BC V0J 2N0
Phone: 250-847-4764
Fax: 250-877-7711
E-mail: forest@islandnet.com

Willard Sparrow

David Suzuki Foundation
Suite 209-2211 West 4th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V6K 4S2
Phone: 604-732-4228
Fax: 604-732-0752
E-mail: willard@davidsuzuki.org

Larry Stranberg

Office Manager
Community Futures Development
Corporation
P.O. Box 621
Bella Coola, BC V0T 1C0
Phone: 250-799-5744
E-mail: happytrails@belco.bc.ca

Gary Sutherland

Planning Manager
Vancouver Forest Region
2100 Labieux Road
Nanaimo, BC V9T-6E9
Phone: 250-751-7256
Fax: 250-751-7198
E-mail Gary.Sutherland@gems9.gov.bc.ca

Sinclair Tedder

Economics and Trade Branch
Ministry of Forests, Province of BC
P.O. Box 9514
Victoria, BC V8W 9C2
Phone: 250-387-8605
Fax: 250-387-5050
E-mail: sinclair.tedder@gems1.gov.bc.ca

James Walkus

Chief Councilor
Gwa'sala-'Nakwaxda'xw
Box 1606
Port Hardy, BC V0N 2P0
Phone: 250-949-7223
Fax: 250-949-7239

Cheryl Wilson

Community Relations
Coastal Community Network
#4-502 Dallas Road
Victoria, BC V8V 1B2
Phone: 250-812-5652
Fax: 250-383-1903
E-mail: coastcom@island.net

Beverly Tanchak

PO Box 1774
Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0
Phone/Fax: 604-885-2330
E-mail: btanchak@sunshine.net

Jim Walker

Assistant Deputy Minister
Wildlife, Habitat & Enforcement Division
Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks
PO Box 9339 Stn. Prov. Govt.
Victoria, BC V8W 9M1
Phone: 250 356-0139
Fax: 250 387-5669
E-mail: jim.walker@gems8.gov.bc.ca

Bill Wareham

Executive Director, Sierra Club of BC
576 Johnston Street
Victoria, BC V8W 1M3
Phone: 250-386-5255
Fax: 250-386-4453
E-mail: bill@sierraclubbc.org

Pieter van Gils

Director, Economic Development
Ecotrust Canada
Suite 202-1226 Hamilton Street
Vancouver, BC V6B 2S8
Phone: 604-682-4141
Fax: 604-682-1944
E-mail: pieter@ecotrustcan.org

Charlene Zietsma

PhD Candidate, Organizational Behaviour
Faculty of Commerce & Business Admin.
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC V6T 1N5
Phone: 604-822-5002
Fax: 604-822-6970
E-mail: zietsma@interchange.ubc.ca

Facilitation and Event Management:**Julian Griggs**

Principal
Dovetail Consulting Inc.
105-2590 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC V6H 3H1
Phone: 604-737-6844
Fax: 604-737-2607
E-mail: jrgriggs@interchange.ubc.ca

Bryan Evans

Senior Associate
Dovetail Consulting Inc.
105-2590 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC V6H 3H1
Phone: 604-737-6834
Fax: 604-737-2607
E-mail: bevans@interchange.ubc.ca

Sandra Bicego

Associate
Dovetail Consulting Inc.
105-2590 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC V6H 3H1
Phone: 604-737-6846
Fax: 604-737-2607
E-mail: sbicego@interchange.ubc.ca

Karin Foreman

Assistant
Alex Grzybowski & Associates Ltd.
6635 Vine Street
Vancouver, BC V6P 5W6
Phone: 604-809-3139
E-mail: forem55@attglobal.net