

**HAIDA GWAII MARINE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Meeting #12**

**May 12 – 14 2014**

**Old Massett Community Hall, Haida Gwaii**

**2:00 PM (May 12) to Noon (May 14)**

**Marine Advisory Committee members:** Doug Daugert, LaVerne Davies, Sabine Jessen, Lynn Lee, Leandre Vigneault, John McCulloch, Jim McIsaac, Mike McGuire, Tony Pitcher, Allan Wilson, Lindsey Doerksen

Absent with regrets: Bill White, Judson Brown

**Co-Chairs:** Russ Jones (HOTT), Berry Wijdeven (BC)

**Haida Ocean Technical Team:** Jason Thompson, Chris McDougall, Catherine Rigg

**BC MaPP Technical Team:** Brad Smith (BC)

**MaPP Technical Support:** Hannah Horn

**Observers:** Molly Clarkson (HOTT Communications), Meighan Wilson (CHN Communications)

**ACTION ITEMS**

#	WHAT	WHO	COMPLETED
12-1	Update to Feb 21 conference call notes: Page 2, bottom of page – heading ‘Masset Inlet’ with ‘Dixon Entrance’.	HGTT	Done
12-2	Add best available information on the recreational fishing economy for BC and HG.	HGTT	Done
12-3	Compare strategies in the plan with the SFAB vision. Consider potential edits to the plan to make more consistent, if appropriate.	Cathy/ HGTT	Done. Plan is generally consistent with SFAB Vision.
12-4	Check if setbacks from the marine foreshore are included in local planning regs e.g., Area D zoning and report to MAC.	Berry	
12-5	Sabine to distribute link to Greenfire productions film about MaPP.	Sabine	Done
12-6	HGTT to consider MAC comments as part of plan review and update	HGTT	Done

## **DAY 1 – May 12, 2014**

Meeting called to order at 2:00 pm.

Opening Prayer by Allan Wilson

### **1. Review of Meeting Objectives:**

The CHN Co-Chair reviewed the meeting objectives:

1. Update on public release and public consultation process
2. Review a summary of the feedback of public and stakeholder feedback and provide advice on changes to the plan

### **2. Review agenda**

*Motion: Adopt the Meeting #12 Agenda.*

*Motion carried by consensus.*

*Motion: Adopt the Meeting #11 Minutes and Feb 21 conference call notes with minor amendments.*

*Motion carried by consensus.*

**Action 12-1: Edit to Feb 21 notes: Page 2, bottom of page – Replace ‘Masset Inlet’ with ‘Dixon Entrance’.**

### **3. Review of Action Items**

*(a) March 11 MAC meeting*

All actions completed.

*(b) Feb 21 conference call*

All actions completed.

### **4. Update on public consultation for the HG draft Marine Plan**

- Russ update – summary of comments to May 9 2014.
- Date for public comments extended from May 7 to May 21 2014.

*Questions and Discussion (by MAC unless otherwise noted):*

- Positive impression of the public meetings in terms of their organization and presentation.
- Great attendance and response by people from the communities.

## 5. Review of proposed aspatial changes to the draft marine plan

### 1. Vision, ethics and values

*Consideration for MAC:* Whether/ how to provide balance in characterizing commercial vs rec fishing?

Recreational fishery data is available but dated. Could augment the information in the marine tourism and HWB sections. The plan does list the landed value of commercial fisheries but not that of other sectors such as recreational fishing and shellfish aquaculture.

*Questions and Discussion (by MAC unless otherwise noted):*

- There are various and conflicting studies that have been done. Need to choose the most appropriate sources to reference in the plan e.g., Gislason 2004 and Gardner Pinfold 2011.
- Need to be clear about the distinct assumptions and caveats associated with recreational fishing data e.g., area covered, what data used, retail vs landed value. Suggestion to include GDP for BC and economic value to HG to the extent possible.

**Action 12-2: Add best available information on the recreational fishing economy for BC and HG.**

- Question about how recreational fishing fits into the section on Community-based Fisheries Economy.
- Question about zoning for geoduck aquaculture e.g., OMVC interest.
- Concern that the definition of EBM in the plan, which was developed with the HG Marine Work Group, is not the same as the PNCIMA definition of EBM i.e., to seek the co-existence of a healthy environment and healthy communities.
- Concern from community members - they are ok with PMZs designated where no-one can fish or only for personal FSC use, but if the PMZs are to be used for economic purposes it is not conservation and that is problematic.
- Concern about effect of the plan on commercial salmon trolling in Area F as DFO has already closed 80% of available area to commercial salmon trolling.
- IUCN categories are under heavy criticism. They are hard to use and the way they are being applied around the world is different. Noted that BC and Canada have committed to using them.
- Point 1c (pg 2) – SFAB Vision for recreational fisheries in BC. Does the CHN intend to review the SFAB Vision document? The SFAB document is a 5-year vision developed with BC and DFO. First Nations were not involved.

**Action 12-3: Compare strategies in the plan with the SFAB vision. Consider potential edits to the plan to make more consistent, if appropriate.**

## 2. General Management Direction

### *Considerations for MAC:*

- Is there support for proposed changes to the GMD text e.g., sea otters, fossils, youth involvement in research and monitoring, management at the interface of land and sea?
- Whether/ how to communicate differences between recreational fishing for local sustenance and for business?

### *Questions and Discussion (by MAC unless otherwise noted):*

- Concern that sea otters and predator control are mentioned together. Be clear in the text that sea otter re-introduction is not the intention (rather that there would be a natural process of re-establishment).
- Are there any regulations on setbacks from the marine foreshore? There is nothing in the land use or marine plans e.g., developments approaching the foreshore in Kumdis Slough.

Action 12-4: Berry to check if setbacks from the marine foreshore are included in local planning regs e.g., Area D zoning.

- Would like the plan to emphasize the importance of engaging local government, stakeholders and interest groups during implementation in the Governance section.
- Would like to see an amendment to Strategy 3.1A, section 6.5 to remove “to address recreational fishing issues” from the end as it implies that recreational fishing is negative.

## 3. Marine Economic Development

*Consideration for MAC:* Is there support for proposed changes to the EED text e.g., demographics, transportation needs, possible future zoning for tidal energy?

- Proposal to add information about demographic trends in the community and adding that component to the beginning of the Ec Dev section. Suggestion to talk about economic drivers, including mention of markets, climate change and things that can't be controlled locally but affect the local economy.
- Suggestion to define resource benefit agreements.
- Suggestion to clarify about the potential for future zoning for renewable energy to the Marine Renewable Energy section (s 7.5)

#### 4. Marine Spatial Zoning – aspatial changes

##### *Considerations for the MAC:*

- Whether to be more explicit about the provincial position on finfish aquaculture in the plan?
- How to deal with restrictions on anchoring in protection zones?

##### *Questions and Discussion (by MAC unless noted by open bullet):*

- Suggestion to designate certain areas within PMZs for anchorages as part of more detailed planning. Anchors do bottom damage.
  - For something that detailed, would be something addressed on a case-specific basis to determine where anchoring is appropriate. There may not be anchoring allowed in some high protection zones. Suggestion to make anchoring conditional – to be determined during the development of individual management plans.
- Supportive of mooring buoys and re-installation of can buoys – they are essentially one big anchor that won't drag.
- Noted that mooring buoys are currently federal jurisdiction.
- Clarification of efforts to make the planning processes between the MaPP sub-region and Gwaii Haanas consistent e.g., federal commitment to use IUCN categories.

#### 5. Special Management Zones

##### *Considerations for MAC:*

- Should we clarify in the plan that applications can be made outside of SMZs (in appropriate zones) and differences in the tenuring process within and outside of SMZs?
- Should any additional areas be zoned as SMZs for shellfish aquaculture or renewable energy?

##### *Questions and Discussion (by MAC unless noted by open bullet):*

- No comments on SMZs.
- Question about the role of the Haida Gwaii marine advisory committee in planning for Gwaii Haanas.
  - This has not yet been determined.

## 6. Implementation, Monitoring and Enforcement

*Consideration for MAC:* How to strengthen direction for implementation, monitoring and enforcement in Chapter 9 e.g. integrated monitoring and enforcement model, community-based monitoring, Haida traditional management systems?

Suggestion from Hereditary Chiefs to highlight Haida traditional management systems in the plan. As an example, create a pilot project for traditional marine management in Skidegate Inlet or Masset Inlet as part of plan implementation.

*Questions and Discussion (by MAC unless otherwise noted):*

- Question regarding defining traditional management systems.

## 7. Plan Assessment

Update on the current MaPP plan assessment contract with Robinson and Associates. The consultants have proposed a multiple accounts approach to look at trends with and without the plan. The Terms of Reference is still under discussion. In the short term, the team is developing a framework for assessment.

*Questions and Discussion (by MAC unless otherwise noted):*

- Fisheries and associated economic activities, such as seafood processing, should be included in the plan assessment. They are indicators of how healthy the ecosystem is. Also ties to community wellbeing e.g. the Ecotrust report.
- Suggestion to include marine transportation due to its importance for a number of marine sectors.

## 8. Data and Analysis

HOTT has received additional data from Underwater Council of BC regarding dive values. As new information becomes available, we are happy to use it so that we are working with the best available information.

Clarification about MAC access to Seasketch, including access-restricted layers. MAC access varies depending on MaPP data-sharing agreements.

## 9. Planning Process/Consultation

HGTT will update the description of stakeholder engagement in the plan. HG has held more comprehensive meetings with stakeholders and interested groups compared to other sub-

regions because the HG process did not have sector representation (unlike other MaPP sub-regional advisory committees).

Closing Prayer - Allan

## **Day 2: May 13, 2014**

Opening Prayer - Allan

### **1. Reflections from Day 1**

- What is the role of stakeholders moving forward?
  - The plan is focused on government-to-government relationships but stakeholders play an important role in how marine resources are managed.
  - Have not had much discussion yet about implementation. The MPA Network process will also provide opportunity for ongoing stakeholder involvement.

### **2. Discussion of spatial changes to the draft marine plan**

*Led by Chris McDougall (HOTT). Noted that some of the proposals had not been reviewed by BC.*

#### 1a. Kiusta to Lepas

*Issue/Proposal:* To change the top Type II polygon to Type IV to allow continuation of future recreational salmon fishing opportunities (no bottom contact but some fishing could continue). The objective is to keep that bottom habitat intact rather than to protect salmon (as they are migrating through). The area is important to fishing because it provides shelter from southeast winds.

- Concern about loss of areas of high protection – if a Type II is lost from this area an equivalent Type II for rockfish and halibut should be identified somewhere else.
- If the objective is to conserve rockfish and lingcod, having a shallow PMZ won't address the protection of values. Fishing is usually 45 – 50 feet on the edge of the kelp.
- This area falls within critical habitat for humpbacks and orcas.

#### 1b. NW Langara and Cloak Bay

*Issue/Proposal:* Adjustments to Cloak Bay boundary to capture bottom habitat structure – the boundary moves out to capture pinnacles, more topography, then cuts back. Changed due to concern about impact to trollers and recreational fishers who are primarily targeting migratory species.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Suggested Type IV Kuista to Lepas and Type 1b at NW Langara with adjustments at Cloak Bay to capture bottom habitat structure.
- Extend the green zone clear of Lacey (25 fathom) with a Type IV outside of that to allow salmon trolling but protecting from bottom contact.
- Make the area high protection to the 20 – 25 fathom edge.
- Management plan could allow trolling from Lacey to the lighthouse.
- ENGO proposal to have a large Type IV around the whole of Langara to recognize values while allowing recreational fishing (instead of mix of Type II and VI).

2. Beresford Bay

*Issue/Proposal:* Possible alternative site for additional high protection with lower socio-economic impact. The Beresford Bay area has 3 highly ranked estuaries, many salmon streams, herring spawn areas, and La Perouse Reef. The red sea urchin dive fishery occurs in the area (based on the 4 km grid) at around 60ft depth. Salmon and tuna troll, halibut fishing, and mid-water trawl also occur (but available data is too coarse to be useful for this scale of planning).

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Does not show up in the conservation sector analysis so would not want to capture it in a Type 1b or II.
- This area does not show up in the BCMCA but this could be due to lack of inventory. The charts for this area are relatively dated (1930s) – area noted as ‘foul ground’ because not surveyed.
- A large number of trollers use this as a troll tack and they place a high value on it, but most activity is outside of the 20 fathom line.
- Suggest creating a PMZ that goes from the centre of La Perouse Reef to hook up to Frederick. The north is sand and gravel bottom but La Perouse and south have more rockpiles. Would need to decide whether or not to allow for the red sea urchin dive fishery.
- Consider more conservation on the north end (Marchand Reef).

3. Frederick Shelf

*Issue/Proposal:* Type IV corridor between RCA and 50 fathom depth to enable continued future commercial salmon and halibut trolling opportunities. Additional Type IV buffers along the northern and southern boundaries.



*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Concern about proposal to put a corridor through this PMZ as it interrupts east-west representation with the loss of a continuous area from the coast.
- Have to consider safety – only have so many anchorages to get out of the weather.
- Move proposed Frederick Shelf corridor west so clipped off at 30 – 60 fathoms. Could go deeper. Could extend the zone 2 km north and encompass La Perouse as a type 1b. Keep the 2 km buffer.
- In future discussions with DFO, propose trading off protection at Frederick by re-opening other traditional trolling areas further south e.g., Areas 6 and 7 outside Milbanke Sound; anything from Flamingo North - Kootenay, Tasu – east side Louscoone and Luxana.
- Look at innovative zoning and management direction e.g., requiring the troll fleet to work within a fixed depth range.

4. Gospel Island

*Issue/Proposal:* Change from a 1b to a Type IV so have control over some fishing but is not completely a no-fishing area. Rennell Sound is popular for recreational fishing and is accessible by road. There is currently a 500m buffer around Gospel Island established as part of CHN/BC protected areas to protect seabird values (although the birds are not listed species).

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Is an area of high use. Given all the people that go there, it may be beneficial to have some protection for rockfish. Would be easy to fish out the area.
- Yakoun estuary, Gospel – are small areas but highly charged due to importance to local fishers.

5. Cartwright Sound

*Issue/Proposal:* High level of concern about this PMZ in the public meetings due to the amount of recreational salmon fishing that occurs in the area. Proposal to turn the PMZ into a Type IV to allow for salmon fishing but restrict bottom contact to protect rockfish populations. There are differing opinions on the health of rockfish populations in the area. Maintain some higher level protection in shallower areas where rockfish are depleted.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- It would be a mistake to make the whole area a Type IV. Could leave half in Cartwright Sound as a Type II (east of Marble) and zone all of Kano Inlet as a Type II.
- This is a large protected area and a traditional fishing area – would be forcing people to run through that area to get to fishing, which doesn't make sense.

- In certain weather conditions, the only place you can fish is to the north.
- Are trading a lot of Type II for Type IV. Need to compensate.
- The area around Hunter Point is amazing. Have a more diverse group of fish in that little area than in Cartwright Sound. Canaries, lingcod, endangered bocccios.
- If we are making decisions about closing an area to recreational fishing, it would be good to have people involved who fish there e.g., Cartwright Sound Charters. Noted that there was engagement with the local SFAB and interested recreational fishery service providers.
- There is a safety consideration. Closing groundfish fishing in the area will push people around Hunter Point and force people to use bigger boats and take greater risks. The Kano option preferable for this reason.
  - Proposal to retain upper portion of the Cartwright Sound Type 1b (east of Marble) and also capture all of Kano Inlet, including Hunter Point.

## 6. Kaisun and Denham Shoals

*Issue/Proposal:* Denham Shoals is important to local fishers but they acknowledge that the rockfish population has been hard hit. Other options – (i) to the north: Annesley Point north to Kitgoro, (ii) to the south: Kootenay Inlet to Tasu Sound; (iii) Newcombe Inlet – similar ecological values but less economic impact; less fishing pressure.

### *MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- These alternatives are not equivalent.
- Don't have to go too much further south and there is a protected area with Gwaii Haanas.
  - Noted Gwaii Haanas is not fully protected – zones will be determined as part of the Gwaii Haanas management planning process.
- Denham Shoals area – a Type IV area would allow salmon fishing while protecting rockfish. Keep a Type II core (e.g., 2 x 3 km)
- Kootenay to Red Rock (halfway to Chad's Point) was a trolling tack for many fishers including for food fishing. Inside Kootenay Inlet are crabs, salmon seine fishery.
- The entrance to Tasu is a spectacular and diverse feature.
- Chad's Point is even more spectacular. Is a real hot spot for coral and is very rich and diverse. Is self-policing for longline fishing because you lose your gear. Different species of rockfish, turtles.

- Some support for changing Denham Shoals to a Type IV and creating a Type II at Tasu Sound and Chad's Point. More interest in this option compared to proposals for Annesley to Kitgoro or Newcombe.

### 7. Yakoun Estuary

*Issue/Proposal:* Locals want to continue local access for recreational fishing. Easy access, cutthroat trout, young people fish there.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Make the east side of the Yakoun River a Type IV with recreational fishing allowed and keep the west side as a 1b.
- Maintain the Type IV zone at Juskatla Narrows, allowing recreational fishing and renewable energy development if this proves feasible in the future.

### 8. Northern Masset Sound

*Issue/Proposal:* Change southern-most portion of Northern Masset Sound from a Type II to a Type V to enable continued access to Maast Island during "weather days".

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Support for changing the southern-most portion from a Type II to a Type V

### 9. McIntyre Bay

*Issue/Proposal:* Suggestion to have some protection but there are many existing activities – salmon fishing, halibut, razor clam, crab, commercial and recreational. Don't anticipate a huge appetite for a PMZ.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- No MAC comments on this area.

### 10. Rose Spit

*Proposal:* Suggestion to increase the level of protection in this area. High conservation values identified in Marxan. Heard that if PMZs are in shallow areas (<10 fathoms) it is okay, except for crab fishermen.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Wouldn't want to see it expanded more than what it is. An expansion to the PMZ would displace coho fishers to an already heavily subscribed fishing area. They are already boxed into a little postage stamp area.

- In the past, when fished further west, there was high interception of local (HG) coho stocks. DFO moved the fleet further east to intercept migratory stocks. If moved, will be back intercepting local stocks or Central Coast stocks (also in trouble).
- A buffer would allow the troll and crab to continue – are the two main activities there. Could consider changing the buffer under adaptive management.
- Consider adding a buffer to Rose Spit that allows trolling for migratory coho and crabbing to continue.

### 11. Renewable Energy SMZ

*Proposal:* To reduce the size of the Hecate SMZ for renewable energy from the investigative permit area to the smaller area approved through the environmental assessment for wind energy.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- No general disagreement with this proposal

### 12. Central Hecate

*Proposal:* Area A Crab Fishery Association has offered to share data on crab fishing effort. Can use this high resolution data to assess where the main fishing effort is versus the protection we are trying to achieve (i.e., to protect groundfish species and habitat, spawning areas and rearing areas for sole, sablefish, dogfish, other benthic species). Propose creating 2 or 3 smaller zones instead of one large swath – but still want to keep the zones fairly large.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Central Hecate not about managing for crabs, it is for other species, groundfish spawning and rearing areas. Wanted a swath of an ecotype.
- Are aiming for a co-existence of protected values and the crab fishery.
- Recommend revisiting the Central Hecate PMZ in consideration of crab data e.g., from a continuous east-west band to a small number of large rectangles. Look for opportunities to provide north-south as well as east-west representation.

### 13. Sheldon Bay to Gwaii Haanas

*Proposal:* Extend the entire zone to the south. Limestone is an important access spot for recreational fishing out of the south end of Graham and Sandspit, either coming out of Morseby Camp or coming down from Skidegate Inlet. Particular concern about Reef/ Low Islands.

*MAC suggestion:*

- The existing PMZ does not preclude anyone from fishing in any weather. As long as recreational fishing is allowed, including groundfish recreational fishing, don't see much room for complaint. Is a good compromise. The species you can catch inside the proposed PMZ (halibut and rockfish) you can also catch outside of the PMZ.
- Limestone PMZ – need a provision to retain the long-standing research station (even though it is a Type II).
- Recommend no change to Limestone/Reef but need to allow continued use by existing research station.

14. Offshore Sites

*Issue/Proposal:* Concern raised about potentially limiting future access to key offshore sites – notably Cape St James, Learmouth Bank and South Celestial Reef. No new info has been brought forward to aid in boundary adjustments.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- Suggestion to change Kindakun Sponge Shelf from a Type IV to a Type 1b.

15. Dixon Entrance

*Issue/Proposal:* Asked for any comments.

*MAC Suggestions/Discussion:*

- The west end of Virago showed up as having high value for geoduck.

16. Discussion of PMZs in general

- Need to focus on the kind of values being protected. What is the difference between a Type II and Type IV – what are we protecting for and can some uses be allowed and still achieve the objective?
- Research is showing that if you want effective MPAs, you need to have no-fishing areas.
- Concern that proposed PMZs are pushing commercial fishers out of productive areas.
- Comment that Canada has introduced strong fishing regulations so the approach of blocking off highly productive areas may not be as necessary.
- Concern that in highly productive areas for commercial fishing it is harder to get accurate information from the fishers.
- In fisheries right now, the amount of detail being collected on boats is incredible with monitoring on-board and at dockside. This kind of data collection is costly and not sustainable for the small boat fishery and would not be sustainable in the recreational fishery.

- Concern that the total area of Type I and II PMZs is reduced.
- Noted that large no-trawl areas (i.e. not no-take areas) in other jurisdictions are having positive effects.
- Need more information about areas that the industry would agree to closing. Don't feel the feedback from commercial fishing has included many constructive suggestions regarding locations of PMZs, other than from the crab fishery.
- Comment on the value of having PMZs within high use / accessible areas that people can point to as examples of conservation management.

### **3. MaPP Regional Priorities Plan Update**

- The MaPP Regional Priorities Plan brings together topics of shared interest among the four sub-regions and identifies strategies that are potentially implementable at a regional scale. Latest draft is undergoing internal technical review. May not complete a final document before the end of June.

### **4. Implementation**

- Section 9.2 of the plan (Marine Planning Priorities) is still under development. Plan priorities are based on content in the entire plan e.g., some priorities are guided by the GMD and associated strategies; some priorities are a reflection of desired plan outcomes e.g., establishment of an MPA network.

MAC members discussed and reported on their priorities for implementation:

- General comment to focus on short-term priorities and quicker wins/tangible results

Specific priorities (in order of reporting, not priority):

- Maintain the history of the process and knowledge base moving forward as this will be important for future engagement with stakeholders and others. People should stay engaged, to some degree.
- Commitment to stakeholder and community involvement in implementation to create sustainable and durable solutions.
- Governance - tripartite arrangements with engagement of the federal government to allow implementation of the marine plan in its entirety.
- Training of youth in capacity-building and stewardship.
- Habitat restoration – e.g., streams and overall habitat. Increase stewardship capacity through restoration. Restoration projects are tangible and visible.
- Community-based fisheries to create a vibrant and sustainable fishery that supports local communities.
- Build marine tourism – importance of marketing Haida Gwaii nationally and internationally. Need to sustain tourism interest.

- Haida Gwaii Code of Ethics – achievable – engages lots of sectors/stakeholders.
- Shellfish aquaculture – applications are pending, need to be prepared.
- MPA establishment and implementation. Start monitoring MPAs now; it is important to establish baseline data and support long-term research
- Research and monitoring to gain a better understanding of how Haida Gwaii ecosystems work and implications of activities, build knowledge of trends and values, and create jobs. Suggestion to establish a marine oceans research centre on Haida Gwaii linked to a terrestrial institute.
- Enforcement – bring First Nations and government enforcement together
- Elevate provincial commitment to marine governance and plan implementation.
- Human resources – discussion around the need to support and build local entrepreneurs. Suggestion to have a prize for the best plan to revitalize the marine economy and make implementation work.

#### **5. Next Steps for Plan Completion:**

- The current deadline is June 30. The Haida Gwaii plan is expected to be completed by June 30 but may take longer for approvals.
- Work is continuing on regional priorities.
- Suggestion to focus on stakeholder engagement as we move forward into implementation. Advisory Committees and engagement sessions have been an important part of the process.
- Clarification that the set of comments on the plan will not be publicly released but an articulation of responses will be drafted and shared. Internally, every comment gets logged, discussed and considered.

#### **6. Thanks to the MAC**

- Berry – MAC members commended on their effort and dedication and willingness to discuss tricky and controversial issues.
- Russ – on behalf of CHN, thanks to the MAC for their commitment. Has been productive and really has improved the product.

Presentation of a print by John Edenshaw to each MAC member – The Sculpin. There is an oral history around sculpins. In oral history, the sculpin fins shelter people from harm.

#### **7. Comments on the process from MAC members**

- Positive comments about the experience, learning, positive relationships, and the creation of trust in the face of tough decisions moving forward.
- Hope that Haida Gwaii will be better for all the work done at the table.
- Great people – diverse people who know so much about Haida Gwaii. Resulted in a plan that will ensure that what happens in the water is sustainable.

- Interest in continuing to work together as part of implementation.
- Thanks to the CHN and BC for all their work to support the process.

### **Day 3 – May 14, 2014**

Opening Prayer

#### **1. Summary of Days 1 and 2**

Russ provided a summary of key points.

*MAC Questions and Discussion:*

- Liaison with Gwaii Haanas – suggestion to find out what NC and CC are doing re MPAs. Concern about linkages between PMZ zoning in Haida Gwaii and other sub-regions, that spatial zones don't always match up and the representation bands end at the Haida Gwaii boundary.
  - Noted that zones for the other plan areas are completed and posted on Seasketch. Will need to assess the overall picture when we bring the plans together as part of MPA Network planning.

#### **2. Updates**

##### a. MaPP planning (Brad Smith)

- MaPP formally ends on June 30. Discussion of bridge funding into implementation.
- HG technical team next steps: Need to look at implementation priorities,(short to medium term). After the consultation period ends on May 21, will collate comments and identify responses and incorporate into the plan.
- The HGTT will provide information on the plan to the MAC prior to final plan release.

**Action 12-5. Sabine to distribute link to Greenfire productions film about MaPP.**

**Action 12-6. HGTT to consider MAC comments as part of plan review and update.**

##### b. PNCIMA process and plan (Cathy Rigg)

- Parks Canada has supported the PNCIMA plan. There are two outstanding issues delaying completion:
  1. Transport Canada did not want to endorse the PNCIMA plan prior to legal review.
  2. Some member Nations within CFN have been reluctant to support to the plan until an agreement is in place on how First Nations would engage in the MPA Network process.



### c. Gwaii Haanas (Hilary Thorpe)

- The Archipelago Management Board (AMB) is implementing the interim management plan, working towards completion of a full management plan in 2015. The Gwaii Haanas Management Plan will be integrated (land – sea – people) for the whole area (marine and terrestrial). Will be a short document – approx. 10 pages developed through a planning process with DFO and CHN.
  - Step 1 is a report on the state of Gwaii Haanas (back to 2007). One issue is that monitoring is well-developed for the terrestrial area, but there is no established national marine monitoring program.
  - Step 2 is a scoping document – what are the big issues? Will have a better sense of priorities, strategies and targets for the next 10 years.
- AMB will be advertising for an advisory committee for the management plan consisting of 12 – 15 people, meeting Sept 2014 – Sept 2015 and perhaps every year after that. Decision to advertise for a new table (not just engage the MAC). MAC members are encouraged to apply for the Gwaii Haanas advisory committee.

### *MAC Questions and Discussion:*

- We were lucky this year. The herring fishery was open but industry decided to back off. Hope this issue will be addressed at the AMB level.
- What if Parks Canada allocated fisheries within an NMCA?
  - Noted that NMCAs are not supposed to be all no-take; they are supposed to allow for sustainable use as well. If no fishing, it becomes impossible to establish NMCAs – it changes the discussion.

Tony described his herring research project in partnership with the Haida and Heiltsuk Nations.

### d. SGaan Kinghlas – Bowie Seamount (SK-B) planning (Cathy Rigg)

- SK-B Mgmt Plan is drafted but not complete. Some recent progress in three outstanding areas:
  - Sablefish fishing in the MPA – The sablefish IFMP was completed at the end of January. Agreement to adopt an interim approach with conditions, including reduced fishing opportunities, video-cameras on traps to record habitat, and a coral and sponge encounter protocol.
  - Conservation Objectives – Level of detail around conservation objectives in the management plan will be informed by the DFO risk assessment for the MPA.
  - Vessel traffic – Rosaline Canessa (University of Victoria) hopes to use the MPA as a case study to model vessel movements and noise exposure.

e. Marine Protected Area Network Team (Brad Smith)

- First Nations are discussing how to participate in MPA network planning. First Nations formal engagement in the process will be a big step to move forward.
- Release of the Canada-BC MPA Strategy is pending federal approval.
- A set of objectives for the Northern Shelf bioregion are being developed.

*MAC Questions and Discussion:*

- The MPA network process could take a long time. It is important to look at other MPA designation tools, including federal tools, to establish MPAs.

f. Geographic response planning (Russ Jones)

- GRPs are response plans if there are emergencies, such as spills. MaPP has a commitment to hold workshops in the four sub-regions. CHN has agreed to lead workshops to identify resources that are available on Haida Gwaii and to gauge support and resources for development of GRPs.
- Workshops are scheduled for Jun 17 – 19 in Masset or Skidegate, with participation by local groups with the resources to participate in emergency response. Will include representatives from BC, Parks Canada, local government, other interested provincial/federal agencies, people with vessels and/or training in emergency response.

Adjourned at Noon.