

Johnstone Strait Recreation Project: Summary of Workshop # 3

Date: January 23rd: 9 am to 5 pm

Location: Best Western The Westerly Hotel, 1590 Cliffe Ave., Courtenay, BC

Attendees:

Representative	Interest/Organization
Anette Thingsted	WG Chair, Integrated Land Management Bureau
Cindy Walsh	Integrated Land Management Bureau
Diane Teteranko	WG Deputy chair, Integrated Land Management Bureau
Julie Chace	Project Manager, Integrated Land Management Bureau
Luigi Sposato	Manager, Integrated Land Management Bureau
Chief Harold Sewid	Mamalilikulla Qwe Qwa Sot Em
Scott Harris	Nanwakolas First Nation Council
George Sranko	Consultant
Terje Vold	Consultant
Warren Mitchell	Consultant
Charlie Cornfield	Ministry of Tourism, Sport and the Arts, Recreation, Sites and Trails
Chris Kissinger	Ministry of Environment – BC Parks
Jim Johnston	Ministry of Agriculture and Lands
Andrew Jones	Kingfisher Wilderness Adventures
Breanne Quesnel	Spirit of the West Kayaking
Rick Snowdon	Spirit of the West Kayaking
Brian Collen	Sea Kayaking Guides Alliance of BC; Pacific Northwest Expeditions
Evan Loveless	Outdoor Recreation Council/ Sea Kayak Association of BC
Doug Taylor	Comox Valley paddlers club
Ken Vande Burgt	Campbell River paddlers club
Stephanie Meinke	Nanaimo Paddlers
Nic Dedeluk	Cetus Research and Conservation
Ben Beardmore	Simon Fraser University
Jeremy Webb	RRL Consultants
Harry Alfred	Namgis First Nation
Chris Nagel	Sea Kayaking Guides Alliance of BC

1. Welcome and Introductions

Johnstone Strait (JS) Project Chair Anette Thingsted opened the meeting and welcomed participants. Participants introduced themselves and the interests they represent.

- Agenda was reviewed and adopted.
- Campsite maps were posted on the walls and a call for feedback was made to the participants.

Workshop objective: Building on Workshop #2 discussions:

- To discuss the status of opportunity class allocations and to identify next steps;
- To confirm or revise proposed standards for resource or social conditions (i.e. limits of acceptable change - LAC);
- To review proposed management actions that could be initiated if unacceptable resource or social conditions arise (i.e. standards breached); and

- To discuss and confirm recommendations for implementation and monitoring.

2. Draft project report

Terje Vold provided the group with an overview of the JS pilot project draft report in relation to the LAC process, and its use during the workshop.

Terje reviewed the progress made in previous workshops:

Workshop #1 – Port McNeil – Project kick-off

- Project launched, LAC process introduced, participants confirmed
- Key issues were identified

Post-workshop one

- An interview process took place to brainstorm possible Indicators.
- Interviews also addressed diversity of opportunity classes for campsites.

Workshop #2 – Campbell River

- Opportunity classes and indicators defined
- ‘Straw dog’ standards were discussed at break-out sessions and refined

Post-workshop two

- Brainstormed options for management actions if standards are exceeded with project Working Group to support workshop three discussions

Workshop #3 – Courtney, BC – Review management actions, implementation and monitoring recommendations

- Management actions range from public education → regulatory actions
- Opportunity to provide feedback on allocation of opportunity classes (maps on walls)
- Opportunity to work on recommendations for Implementation and Monitoring

Reminder: A goal is to test Limits of Acceptable Change process and determine lessons learned while at same time developing constructive recommendations for improving the management of sea kayaking and camping in the JS area.

The draft project report distributed to all workshop participants served as a ‘workshop workbook’ to guide discussions for most agenda items throughout the day.

Q: Is this the last time for feedback on the draft status report?

A – Terje: No, the status report will be revised after the workshop and further input is welcome, this phase must be completed by March 31st

3. Overview of approval process for LAC pilot project report

Luigi Sposato provided an overview on the Next Steps:

- Thank you to the group for their involvement
- Recognition that the group has been driving the process
- Luigi was involved with the beginning of the project – project charter phase

- Returning now to answer questions about next steps
- History: Joint Steering Committee (JSC) on tourism and recreation posed the question: Can LAC be used as a tool for tourism recreation?
 - Two pilot project areas were selected:
 - Golden
 - Johnstone Strait
- Johnstone Strait – work has been compiled into a draft report
 - Need recommendations and conclusions to answer the main question:
 - Is LAC a suitable tool for recreation planning in BC?
 - This group needs to report back to the JSC
 - Up to the group to decide what to put forward
 - JSC can decide on how to proceed
 - Relevance of LAC process for other areas of the Province
 - Report recommendations should also go to the Coast Inter-Agency Management Committee (IAMC)
 - Discussion on how to move JS project forward
 - One option: discussions with IAMC will provide an opportunity for JS Project to be incorporated into N. Island Strait Plan – Plan would need to be amended, and recommendations would become policy.
 - To test LAC, the pilot process was initiated, but there are key pieces that have not been addressed before any products or recommendations from the pilot could be adopted:
 - Consultation with First Nation (FN) on a government to government (G-to-G) basis
 - Formal public review and comment period

Q – Warren: People from JSC are here. Can they comment on the process?

A – Evan: JSC can make recommendations to government, but does not make decisions. JSC looks at participatory processes as a good thing. This process will likely be supported – would like recommendations put forward.

A: JSC may support, but it depends on the final product.

Q – Ken: How much of this project will change due to the treaty negotiations

A – Luigi: Difficult to answer. There needs to be full consultation and this aspect has not been addressed to date, so the outcome is unsure.

Comment – Harold: wishes to see this as a working document.

Questions related to G-to-G consultations

Q – Harold: Opportunity for G-to-G meeting after this process to discuss this project?

A – Luigi: If there is support for the recommendations put forward to the JSC then G-to-G meetings would follow.

Comment – Warren: Need to capture that a recommendation of the project would be to have full G-to-G consultation.

Comment – Harold: Concern with historical use of territories by resource users without consultation. Use is fine following consultation so that sacred sites, cultural values are upheld.

Q – Jim: Interest in the product here, LAC is used elsewhere, but how does it work in this location.

A – Luigi: To be determined.

4. Opportunity Classes

Terje Vold provided an overview on Opportunity Class (OC) allocation feedback and the Next Steps to complete the task.

Campsite OC allocations – maps, etc. sent out to solicit suggested OC allocations from project participants, deadline was just before Christmas

- Feedback was limited (one partial response)
- This is a key outstanding piece that is not complete
 - Will not be completed by March 31st
 - If the group wishes to proceed to get shared agreement on OC allocations will need to be included in the report as an important implementation task
 - What are the options for making this happen?
 - If there is a decision to move forward after the report has been completed, then proposed future workshop which involves FN, working group, stakeholders with a goal of focusing on the allocation of opportunity classes.

Comment – Chris: this is a key step in implementation. Agree that there should be further work to allocate opportunity classes. Need to pay attention to any glaring issues. This is not only for the foreshore, includes camping in adjacent upland areas as well. Recommend that fees should not be included in the OC class descriptions or factor in allocation process.

Comments related to ‘Not Physically Suitable, No Kayaking’ camping OC wording

- **Suggestion - Andrew:** No camping class, not physically suitable: This campsite allocation should focus on environmental reasons, FN values. Bedrock, for example, should not be considered no camping – some may be able to camp in these areas. Suggest removal of not physically suitable.
- **Comment – Warren:** if remove not physically suitable we will lose the opportunity to describe these areas. Can we keep this class so that there is an opportunity for including management options?
- **Comment – Chris:** Not appropriate for camping would be better wording (protected area, fire hazard, etc.)
- **Comment – Jim:** Recognize that there is value in both management actions as well as information sharing in OC. Camping allocation based on ‘not physically suitable’ may be used for information purposes, would aid unfamiliar paddlers.
- **Comment – Diane:** Agree with Jim, education is a good reason to keep ‘not physically suitable’ as a camping OC.

Comments related to sea kayak OC on the open water wording

- **Comment – Ken:** The wording “Not permitted” type is too strong since there are likely no regulations that do not permit sea kayaking even in ecological reserve
- **Comment – Chris:** Voluntary closure, kayaking discouraged is better wording. Suggest wording changes so people understand why they have to avoid certain areas. (*Note: Chris is getting legal review on situation in ecological reserve.*)
- **Suggestion reached following discussion:** as there has not been a lot of discussion on these OC, generally describe and provide list of considerations but do not define in the report. For example, there may be a need for a marine trail OC.

Comments related to Camping OC Classes

- **Suggestion – Rick:** Difference between Class 3 and Class 4 seems to be a large jump creating a ‘gap’ in opportunities as currently exists– suggest party size description changes occur to allow for 2-3 parties of 2-4 paddlers, or one large group.

Comments related to Human Waste disposal

- **Comment – Harold:** Human waste – believes it must be disposed of in a proper way. Human wastes do affect the marine environment. Suggest zero tolerance for wastes entering the inter-tidal area.
- **Comment – Ken:** Pack waste out – not feasible, no facilities in place to properly dispose of human waste. .

5. Adventure Tourism Survey

- Jim Johnstone – provided introduction to the Survey
 - Website, emails, letters to operators, invites to clubs, postings in shops to advertise the survey
- Ben Beardmore, SFU – presented results to date (note: survey just closed so results are preliminary)
 - Presentation provided as handout
 - Added a discrete choice experiment in ppt and handouts
 - Trade-offs, preferences examined
 - E.g. Not seeing whales has a large negative impact on trip experience, on the other hand, fewer groups, and fewer motorboats was preferred. Next step is to create a decision support system to see how various factors that can affect the trip experience are traded off via the choice experiment.

Questions and Comments from SFU presentation:

Comment – Andrew: Based on wording of the survey, there was no option to fill out the survey as a guide; feedback from guides would have been useful.

Comment – Chris: Survey was designed for recreation users, guides found it difficult to fill it out. Guides have many days of experience but their experiences may not be included in the survey.

Comment Jim: Presentation today focused on information that was most relevant to the LAC process. The survey does include more information.

Q – Terje: When will full report be available?

A – Ben: Possibly in April or May.

Comment – Jim: Welcome feedback that will help to shape the report – provide to Anette or Ben. SFU is also willing to present results at other venues, meetings.

6. Standards

George Sranko provided a review of existing draft standards.. The standards were developed following the breakout sessions at the last workshop. The focus here is to confirm or revise them.

Comments related to standards

Whales and potential impacts

Suggestion – Nic: change indicator to incidences/person – it is better to have a ‘rate’

Condition of campsites and day use sites

Q – Breanne: What are the specifics of BRIM? Would it account for impacts to foreshore area, e.g. clam beds etc.

A – Terje: BRIM (BC Parks’ campsite condition evaluation procedures) details are in previous Progress Report; BRIM could be adapted to address foreshore impacts.

Campsite availability

Comment – Chris: How long does it take to find another site? 10 minutes or an hour may decide how receptive kayakers are to moving to a new site.

Suggestion – Rick: Add experience factor – need to know why people are moving on.

Comment – Scott: 25% seems too high, but need to evaluate why people are moving on.

Need further discussion on this section

FN issues and values

Comment – Ken: Number of incidents reported where cultural heritage artefacts are removed or altered – what is the definition of cultural heritage artefact – i.e. what is included?

Response – Harold: Culturally Modified Trees (CMTs) should be included; everything of cultural heritage significance to FN should be included.

Comment – Evan: We want FN buy-in – 10 years is too long of a time for operators to have formal agreements with FN..

Response – Harold: Agree 10 years is too long.

Response – Chris: Suggests one year is reasonable for protocol agreements (i.e. how operators and FN will work together to develop formal agreements). Consider amending permits and tenures to make it a requirement to have agreements with FN.

Response – Harold: One year or less for agreements is preferable.

Comment – Chris: Need clarification on what is meant by ‘formal’ agreement.

General comment – protocol agreements needed within a year, but formal agreements may take a bit longer to complete.

BREAK FOR LUNCH

7. Management Actions

Terje Vold and George Sranko discussed the purpose of management actions in LAC. They noted that the draft management actions in Appendix 2 of the draft report were developed with JS Working Group feedback, but now need workshop participant review in breakout sessions. They set the stage for break-out group feedback.

Intent of LAC is to work with First Nations, stakeholders and agency staff to develop a range of possible management actions if standards are breached. There is a continuum of management actions for each standard beginning often with education and moving generally much later towards regulatory action if required. If conditions remain at an unacceptable level relative to a standard, the response is to move further on the continuum towards a stricter management action.

LAC provides a framework for assessing if management actions are effective (i.e. are standards being achieved if specified actions taken?)

8. Breakout groups to discuss Management Actions

Information captured from Flip Charts. Each Group was assigned specific issues in Appendix 2 to focus their discussions on management actions to ensure all issues are covered.

Group 1: Issues A and B

- George Sranko
- Anette Thingstead
- Stephanie Meinke
- Nic Dedeluk
- Jeremy Webb
- Ben Beardmore

Issue A: Whales and Potential Impacts of Sea Kayakers

LAC Indicator: Number of reported incidents of sea kayakers failing to comply with “Be Whale Wise” guidelines

(First 3 are similar)

- 1.) Communication (ties into 2)
 - Current information needs to be made available
- 2.) Education (ties into 3)
 - Pre-trip orientation – one idea is having a video kiosk that gives you a ticket once you have watched the orientation, providing proof that can be checked in the field
- 3.) Comprehensive information package (ties back into 1)
 - Should be web based, available on government web site with Links:
 - from commercial operators sites
 - to paddler kayak clubs
 - to tourism BC
- 4.) Volunteer patrols
 - DFO patrols to increase presence (rather than volunteer patrols)
- 5.) Increased enforcement of regulations
 - Increased enforcement of existing regulations and guidelines

Tangent: Discourage commercial operators from posting pictures that depict kayakers too close to the whales

Issue B: Conditions of Campsites and Day Use

LAC Indicator: % of sites with significant to serious impacts by opportunity class (as soon as site is rated BRIM class 3-5, management actions are triggered)

- 1.) Ban fires
 - An issue with enforcement? – currently can only enforce illegal fires in BC or MOTSA rec sites – except when there is a Regional fire ban (e.g. summer season)
- 2.) Seasonal closure of sites – add “fire danger” as potential reason

Plenary Discussion on Issues A and B

Breanne: re: volunteer patrols – North Island Marine Mammal Stewardship Group is already out there doing some volunteer patrols

General: Fire bans: there may be ways to regulate campfires through MoE or MoFR.

Group 2: Issues C and D

- Warren Mitchell
- Cindy Walsh
- Rick Snowden
- Evan Loveless
- Doug Taylor
- Jim Johnston
- Harry Alfred

Issue C: Campsite Availability

LAC Indicator: % of parties making unsuccessful attempts to find a campsite suitable to accommodate their group size during June-September

General: Agreements with FNs will affect campsite availability

1.) Education:

- Essential to have effective information sharing/education
 - i. Map at launch sites
 - ii. Website for advanced planning
 1. Website should be easy to 'google'
 2. Central site with links to commercial sites, information, tides, campsite info – EVERYTHING
 3. Maybe not controlled by government or any one group – a collaborative project
- Effective education may reduce the need for further management actions

2.) Formal means of communication:

- Develop a process for reporting on campsite conditions (feedback into website?)
 - i. Operator reports
 - ii. Public reports
 - iii. Ranger reports (may be valuable to 'hire' a ranger to assist with this management action
 - a. Contracted from government
 - b. FNs

3.) Group size limits:

- Desire to set group size limits early in the continuum of management actions
 - i. Possibly include recommended group size in the education management action

4.) Designated sites:

- Need to separate commercial and recreational use
- Desire to have designated sites for commercial and recreation uses set early in the continuum of management actions
 - i. NOTE: this designation can not exclude/restrict recreational kayakers from using a campsite if necessary (safety)

- ii. Need to coordinate with FNs and commercial operators
- 5.) Reservation system/Permits:
 - May serve a broader purpose that will not be necessary if other management actions are not effective
 - i. Remove this management action or leave as a last resort

Issue D: Recreation Experience

LAC Indicator: % of kayakers indicating dissatisfaction with experience in Johnstone Strait and reason(s) why

General: SFU survey provides valuable information

- 1.) Education – key
 - Can include group size recommendations in education
 - Can include volunteer patrols/ranger patrols in education
 - Focus is on PROACTIVE actions
- 2.) Volunteer patrols
 - May be a way to involve kayaking clubs
 - Ranger for a more formal patrol
- 3.) Changing the LAC Class
 - Add possible water allocations (e.g. restrict motor boats in some areas)

Comment: Dissatisfaction is not something that you can necessarily manage for unless the reason behind the dissatisfaction is known. Managing the issue behind the dissatisfaction is desired. Suggest adding a new management action that analyses dissatisfaction – SOURCE and TREND analysis – management action based on the results of the analysis. This means the dissatisfaction section can essentially be removed – leave the “% of kayakers reporting conflicts with other users, including other sea kayakers” section in.

Plenary Discussion on Issues C and D

Ben – Concern that if kayaker has a poor experience they will leave and not return. No indication of the reason behind their dissatisfaction.

Charlie – Hire a co-op student to do a survey in the field.

Evan – May need to distinguish between proactive and reactive management actions for all sections.

Ken – suggest the option of increasing the number of campsites, as long as environment, recreation experience is maintained within reason.

Group 3: Issues E, F and G

- Terje Vold
- Luigi Sposato
- Breanne Quesnel
- Charlie Cornfield
- Harry Alfred

Issue E: Respect for First Nations Interests and Values

LAC Indicator: % of operators with formal agreements with First Nations (less than 100% by 2018 triggers management action)

- 1.) Formal agreement
 - There is a need for a protocol agreement – how to work together (within a year if possible)
 - i. Formal agreement should follow (second year)
 - ii. Front Counter BC should assist operators in determining what FN to contact
 - Management actions should begin with compliance and then if not effective, enforcement action needs to be considered
 - Compliance: Raise awareness to operator that agreements with FNs needed
 - i. ILMB's role to promote this awareness
 - Enforcement:
 - ii. Ticket/admin penalty
 - iii. Tenure implications (e.g. see 2 below)
- 2.) Formal agreement with First Nations becomes a tenure document requirement
 - where commercial tenure not issued or renewed without agreements in place

LAC Indicator: # of incidents reported where cultural heritage artefacts are disturbed or removed (any incident triggers action)

- 1.) Volunteer patrols
 - Guides with FN training
 - i. Address in formal agreement
 - ii. Some guides operate in several FN territories
 - iii. Yukusam Heritage Society - could provide FN training as it represents all three FN in JS area
 - iv. Training could dovetail with pre-season whale watching training; a Straitwatch networking event

LAC Indicator: % of guides who undertake training in First Nations culture and history (less than 80% by 2018 triggers action)

- This indicator likely broadly applicable including areas outside LAC pilot
- Include as possible recommendation for FN training for guides
- Protocol agreement – in future (not there yet, but one per several FN is desired)
- Guide certification program - include some general FN training, but likely more detailed FN training sessions will be needed
- Artefacts
 - i. Still hear of removals/damage
 - ii. No one has been fined
 - iii. Need enforcement
 - iv. Apparent lack of enforcement/unclear who is responsible
- Interagency Compliance and Enforcement discussions active to clarify roles in government
- Comprehensive 'Communication' package needs to include awareness about Heritage Conservation Act and need to protect cultural heritage artefacts

Issue F: Safety standards

- Generally OK

Issue G: Viability of commercial operators, local communities, and First Nations

- What is local?

- Use FN traditional territories and blend in with Regional Districts
- Certified guide at top level takes two years at least
 - i. Sea kayak guide alliance has ‘guide’ program
 - ii. Other systems also exist
 - iii. In future look at sustainable resource management certification systems such as ISO for operators

Plenary Discussion on Issues E, F and G

General – Information should be available at launch sites and kayak shops

Andrew – National Parks have a model that may be useful

Group 4: Issues H, I and J

- Diane Teteranko
- Julie Chace
- Brian Colleen
- Chris Kissinger
- Rick Snowdon
- Ken Vander Burgt

Issue H: Effective Communication involving stakeholders, FN and operators

LAC Indicator: # of, and attendance at, formal meetings involving stakeholders, First Nations, and community groups (less than 2 per year triggers action)

Most of the time was spent on Issue H: Wording changes to this section were captured by Terje.

- Standards appropriate?
 - Meeting number? – 1 Late Nov/early Dec
 - Include info as to purpose/intent of the meeting
- Review of Project Implementation: Wording change suggested – instead of “involving SH, FNs and Ops” – number of operators, other governments and recreational paddlers
- Management Actions
 - Assign one individual...
 - Establish a steering committee...
 - Immediate actions
- Wording change suggested: Remove ‘requirement’ from before commercial operators

Example – if the number of meetings is not met, what is the management action? Develop a reactive management action to address.

Issue I: Public Information/Education of users

- Standards appropriate?

Issue J: Access

Requires more consideration

- Requires more consideration
- Need to develop a public access site

9. Report out on the breakout group findings

Comments included in previous section

10. Recommendations for Implementation

Terje Vold introduced proposed implementation steps.

- We will revise the draft report following workshop, and send it out to participants as a draft Status Report (rather than calling it a ‘final report’) – as we recognize that there are key sections that have not been developed fully
- Will note under ‘implementation’ the need to complete opportunity class allocations, for public review and comment, and G-to-G consultations with FN should the project proceed to another phase
- We will separate proactive/reactive management actions
- Participant feedback on project (see below) will be summarized in draft JS
- A separate report based on both pilots (JS and Golden) that addresses lessons learned will be compiled for ILMB project manager and the Adventure Tourism JSC
- **Ken** – Suggestion to allocate campsites based on suitability and where people want to camp, allocate some sites for commercial and public recreation but not all of the sites.
- **Andrew** – comment on ‘form implementation team’ - eager to participate, but what is in it for me? Terje noted that review of “implementation” section in draft Status Report will be key – are the implementation needs sufficiently compelling that you would like to participate? If not, what is missing?

11. Recommendations for Monitoring

George introduced the proposed monitoring plan.

- Distinction of changing roles MTSA – responsible for public recreation, ILMB now responsible for commercial recreation
- Monitoring frequency – often on a proposed annual basis for most indicators
- Reporting conflicts – monthly, daily, depending on conflict frequency
- In the table: make clear that Implementation team includes ‘BC Parks’
- Charlie – suggests adding a survey aspect to monitoring – this can be added into operations
- Jim – suggests survey and information sharing plan

12. Participant feedback

Warren – solicited feedback from workshop participants. One objective is to find out if this process works

Review of questions that were provided in the report.

Question 1:

1. **Andrew** – Seem to have jumped to a management plan without really understanding the issues. Some issues may not need managing. For this to be effective – need a multi-day session to really capture the issues and the level of management needed for each issue. If the benefit is clear it would be easier to participate fully.

2. **Breanne** – Concern over direction of the project, yes it is a pilot, but would like to know the exact future steps – management actions decided upon without knowing if these actions will be used or shelved. Also would like to have more clarity with respect to who actually carries the project forward, when and how. Need to understand the overall process early on – who does what, who has responsibility. Feeling that input may not be valued.
3. **Evan** – potential for great benefit from testing LAC process because all nine steps are discussed. Process is based on issues which allows commercial operators, government, First Nations, public recreationists etc to work together.
4. **Brian** – There is actually a structure which we can refer back to. Goalposts are not moving. Seems that with this pilot project the scope expanded past available resources. Clarification of scope – for the amount of time and resources, scope was too large – not enough time to provide adequate input - more meetings may have been needed?
5. **Ken** – should have focused on issues related to kayaker experience – i.e. what is important to kayakers.
6. **Jim** – Question to Brian - in terms of the lack of time, are there steps in the process that would have been more valuable if there were more time? Response from Brian – no, not specifically. Need to spend more time on issues and concerns.
7. **Andrew** – Need a bigger budget to spend more time. Email was an issue – comments may have been misinterpreted.
8. **Question to group** – would you have spent more time? Breanne – nodding yes. Brian - Concerns over final report and what it will look like. Not sure if time invested is worth it.
9. **Evan** – may be valuable to invest time in a survey up front before the process began.
10. **Charlie** – agree with Evan – also need spreadsheet available upfront, baseline inventory is necessary
11. **Ken/Jim** – need to know what the issues are before the survey can be developed. Suggest having first workshop, then survey.
12. **Breanne** – suggest need to visit the area to familiarize everyone with the area and the issues.

Question 2:

1. **Nic** – DFO should have been on board
2. **Charlie** – Local government was also not involved (after the first workshop)– would have been valuable.
3. **Andrew** – all the right people were invited, but some chose not to participate.
4. **Rick** – biologist or scientist input would have been valuable input to determine impacts of exceeding the standards – non-governmental researchers should be invited.

Question 3:

1. Yes

Agreement was made to read over the remainder of the questions individually and the option of responding via email was presented.

Challenges in the Process

Charlie – Desire to discuss implementation as soon as possible, operators probably prefer knowing this by the end of May.

Evan – Breakout groups – ok, but participants do not get to provide input on all issues

Ken – Concern over the draft document changing between meetings. Summarize or track the changes that were made so that everyone can follow the process.

Questionnaire will be mailed to workshop participants with the next version of the document.

13. Final remarks

Terje – Notes were taken throughout the day, flipchart comments will also be incorporated. Document will be updated – will use Track Changes. May change the name of the document to ‘status report’ as discussed. Thanks to all for participating.

Anette – Echo thanks to the participants, and consultants. Email or call for more info. Next steps: will organize another working group meeting in the upcoming weeks.

Diane – Thanks and appreciation. Networking was impressive. Thanks to Anette for jumping in to the process mid-way.