

# WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS 2001-7

sustainable  
forest  
management  
network

réseau  
sur la  
gestion durable  
des forêts



## Workshop on Cumulative Effects of Development in the Treaty 8 Area: Exploring a Research Program

May 15-17, 2001  
Fort St. John, BC

Dianne Korber

For copies of this or other SFM publications contact:

Sustainable Forest Management Network  
G208 Biological Sciences Building  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2E9  
Ph: (780) 492 6659  
Fax: (780) 492 8160  
<http://www.ualberta.ca/sfm>

ISBN 1-55261-142-6

**Workshop on Cumulative Effects of Development in the Treaty 8 Area:  
Exploring a Research Program  
Fort Saint John, B.C.  
May 15 – 17, 2001**

Sponsored and Organized by:  
The Sustainable Forest Management Network

Workshop Proceedings

Prepared by:  
Dianne Korber

## **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary.....	ii
Background.....	1
Workshop Objectives.....	2
Workshop Format.....	
Tuesday, May 15, 2001: First Nations Representatives and Researchers.....	2
Welcome and prayer.....	2
Workshop background and objectives.....	2
Sustainable Forest Management Network Overview.....	3
Sustainable Aboriginal Communities – Criteria and Indicators Research Area H.....	3
Discussion: First Nations’ Perspective.....	4
Wednesday, May 16, 2001: Industry, Government, and First Nations Representatives, and Researchers.....	6
Welcome and prayer.....	6
Workshop background and objectives.....	6
Sustainable Forest Management Network Overview.....	6
Sustainable Aboriginal Communities – Criteria and Indicators Research Area H.....	6
Introduction and Summary of May 15, Tuesday, 2001.....	6
Cumulative Effects Assessment within the Environmental Assessment Process.....	7
Q&A following CEAA presentation.....	9
Discussion: Industry and Government Perspective.....	9
Thursday, May 17, 2001: Researchers and Treaty 8 and First Nation Representatives.....	11
Workshop Participants.....	13
Appendix A: Framework for Assessing Forest Management Alternatives.....	16
Appendix B: Industrial Partner, Aboriginal and Scientific Research Locations...	17

## ***Executive Summary***

Concerns regarding the pace and extent of development in the British Columbia Treaty 8 area prompted members of the Treaty 8 Tribal Association (T8TA) to pursue research on cumulative effects in the area with the goal of developing a cumulative effects assessment strategy for the region. This workshop was organized by the Sustainable Forest Management Network (SFM Network) in response to T8TA's proposal to initiate a dialogue on a cumulative effects assessment and management framework for Northeast B.C. On the first day, discussions were held between First Nations, academics and SFM Network representatives. On the second day, industry and government were invited to join the discussion. The third day featured meetings among T8TA, academic and SFM Network representatives.

The highlights of the discussions were:

- The need for cumulative effects research in the Treaty 8 B.C. area.
- The importance to First Nations of getting research results related to cumulative effects in the short and long term.
- The need to develop a stand-alone initiative to meet the needs of, and led by, First Nations, separate from other existing research initiatives by industry and government.
- The necessity of having resources (leader(s) and funding) to move a research initiative forward.

The following actions were agreed upon:

- First Nations communities would have a visioning exercise before fall, 2001, to focus their goals and objectives related to cumulative effects research.
- SFM Network would work with T8TA in organizing and conducting the visioning exercise.
- SFM Network would assist in securing a principal investigator in time to attend the visioning exercise.
- T8TA would continue to investigate sources of funding for research to meet short-term goals and for the visioning exercise.

Overall, the workshop was successful in cultivating interest, sharing ideas, and identifying the next steps necessary in moving towards the development of a research plan and proposal.

## ***Background***

The Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Network received a letter (dated March 2000) from the Treaty 8 Tribal Association of B.C. (T8TA) stating its interest in initiating a research program on cumulative effects. Treaty 8 covers the northeastern third of the province. There are seven signatory First Nations to Treaty 8 within the B.C. border, and the T8TA has membership of five of these including Doig River, Blueberry River, Halfway River, Sauleau and Dene Tsa Tse K'Nai (Prophet River) First Nations. Based on several years of initial research, and past efforts of initiating cumulative effects research (twice with the B.C. Oil and Gas Commission and in response to the Alliance Pipeline project), the letter identified the broad range of industrial and human activity that has had an impact, or is currently having an impact, in Treaty 8 B.C. Also stated was the desire to identify effective strategies to evaluate and address the impacts of multiple activities on the land that could be used by multiple stakeholders and First Nation governments in a manner that recognizes and respects First Nations' values. The letter identified four key goals associated with the development of a research program:

1. research and develop an effective and workable composite cumulative effects assessment (CEA) strategy,
2. build up research and technical capacity within the Treaty 8 communities, and strong research relationships with Canadian universities,
3. disseminate the results of the project and promote the implementation of the composite CEA strategy, and
4. conduct research that supports the First Nations' relationship to the land, Aboriginal and Treaty rights, and sustainable development in the area.

The letter identified four primary stages for a research program:

1. establish a primary research structure (identify researchers, partners, research relationships, local capacity, and geographic and temporal scope of research, protocols and strategies),
2. collect baseline data and test and evaluate available strategies regarding their usefulness in constructing a composite CEA strategy relevant for the Treaty 8 area,
3. develop and apply composite CEA strategy, and
4. disseminate and implement CEA strategy.

The T8TA submitted the letter to the SFM Network as a first step in identifying interested parties in pursuing a research agenda.

The SFM Network responded by organizing a workshop with invitees from the Treaty 8 First Nations, T8TA, academic researchers, and government and industry with interests in the northeastern B.C. area. The purpose of the workshop was to bring together stakeholders and First Nation governments from the northeastern B.C. area and from academic institutions with interests in cumulative effects research to investigate the potential to initiate a research project that

- a.) would meet local needs and expectations, and
- b.) could be submitted to SFM Network's call for proposals competition, possibly at the end of the 2001 year.

## ***Workshop Objectives***

1. Inform potential stakeholders and people who live in the Treaty 8 area of the Treaty 8 Band's interest in cumulative effects and developing a project to work up a cumulative effects strategy for the Treaty 8 region.
2. Identify participants' perspectives regarding cumulative effects in the region, and collect ideas of how a research project might move forward.

## ***Workshop Format***

The focus of the workshop was information sharing, exchange of ideas, and development of concepts. The workshop investigated the concept put forward by the T8TA to develop a cumulative effects assessment strategy for the Treaty 8 region.

### **May 15, 2001, 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

At the request of the T8TA, First Nations representatives met as a group with university researchers and SFM Network representatives to discuss issues related to cumulative effects of development in the Treaty 8 area, and a research project. Discussion focused on First Nations' perceptions regarding the effects of development, and what the effects are cumulatively. Discussion also focused on First Nations' views on how the project might be researched and funded, and what research questions should be answered.

### **May 16, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

Representatives from industry (forestry and oil and gas), the B.C. government, First Nations, university researchers, and SFM Network representatives met. The discussion was broadened to include issues and concerns from other stakeholders, in addition to those described by First Nations on day one, and to further discuss the potential for research.

### **May 17, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**

University researchers and representatives from T8TA met to identify the next steps in the development of a research agenda that would move towards a cumulative effects assessment strategy for the Treaty 8 area.

## ***Tuesday, May 15, 2001: First Nations Representatives and Researchers***

### **Welcome and prayer**

Peter Duinker, SFM Network and Dalhousie University, and Stewart Cameron, Saulteau First Nation

### **Workshop background and objectives**

Peter Duinker, SFM Network and Dalhousie University

The five-page letter (as referred to above) is the only document so far relating to the possible cooperative effort between SFM Network and T8TA focusing on the cumulative effects assessment in the Treaty 8 area. The letter identified issues of scope such as time -- looking forward and backward a century at all development and activity and the

effects of these activities on all values (ecological, cultural, economic, socio-political). Also provided was a discussion of the goals and stages of a research project, and objectives and agenda of the workshop (as stated above in the Background section).

### **Sustainable Forest Management Network Overview**

Vic Adamowicz, SFM Network Program Leader and University of Alberta

The SFM Network (<http://www.ualberta.ca/sfm>) is a national research agency focused on the goal of sustainable forest management with the tenets of integration of disciplines (social and natural sciences and engineering) and partners. The SFM Network has over 50 formal partnerships including industry, First Nations, governments, non-governmental organizations and Canadian universities. The SFM Network has over 100 researchers at 30 universities, and multiple partnering linkages with network affiliates (such as the National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Canadian Forest Service, Model Forest Network, Forest Engineering Research Institute of Canada, Forest Ecosystem Science Co-op), and national forestry research institutes and associations (such as the Pulp and Paper Research Institute of Canada, Forintek Canada, and Forest Coalition for the Advancement of Science and Technology).

The SFM Network receives 50% of its funding from the Networks of Centres of Excellence (NCE; <http://www.nce.gc.ca>) program and 50% from partnerships (government, industry, First Nations and NGOs). At the time of the workshop, the SFM Network program was currently being reviewed by the NCE, and since has been renewed for another seven years starting in 2002.

Within SFM Network's framework for assessing forest management alternatives, the research project proposed by the T8TA fits within the cross-section between Integrated Resource Management (strategies and alternatives) and Sustainable Aboriginal Communities (criteria and indicators) (see Appendix A). Within this area we would ask: what are the cumulative effects, and what management strategies will sustain Aboriginal communities and other values?

The SFM Network uses five criteria to evaluate and select projects submitted in response to the annual Call For Proposals:

- research excellence,
- development of highly qualified personnel,
- networking and partnerships,
- knowledge exchange, and
- project management.

Research excellence requires that research be interdisciplinary and integrative in focus. The SFM Network review process looks favourably on research that is submitted and integrated with existing priority area groups. The next call for proposals will occur in the fall, 2001. Proposals are reviewed by external peers and the SFM Network Review Committee. This Committee makes recommendations to the SFM Network Research Planning Committee, which in turn makes recommendations to the SFM Network Board of Directors. The Board of Directors makes the final approval.

### **Sustainable Aboriginal Communities – Criteria and Indicators Research Area H**

Marc Stevenson, SFM Network First Nations Research Project Coordinator and Liaison

Sustainable Aboriginal Communities (SAC) is one of the priority research areas identified by SFM Network as essential for achieving SFM. The SAC group is led by Dr. Cliff Hickey at the University of Alberta. There are four research priority areas within the SAC Research Area developed through consultation with First Nations:

- i.) investigate ways to integrate Aboriginal values, traditional knowledge, institutions, philosophy and systems of management into sustainable forest management and policy,
- ii.) accommodating Aboriginal and Treaty rights in SFM, a necessary step in reducing uncertainty in management and decision-making,
- iii.) create economic and capacity development in First Nation communities allowing full participation in the advantages of SFM, and
- iv.) develop criteria and indicators that would measure success at reaching the first three priorities.

The goal is to pursue each of these four research priority areas in each of several geographic regions, as represented by research nodes within the SFM Network, and as illustrated in Appendix B.

In addition to research, the SAC group has also initiated a pilot project involving Aboriginal distance education in forestry with the Network's partner Little Red River / Tall Cree First Nation. The pilot project is being guided by a needs assessment study that looks at levels of capacity:

- i.) within the community and available training;
- ii.) within the forest industry to integrate and utilize additional local capacity; and
- iii.) within existing educational programs to meet both First Nations' and industry's needs.

To achieve its goals, the SAC group places equal importance on research, networking and knowledge transfer.

### **Discussion: First Nations' Perspective**

The discussion was focused on, but not limited to, two main issues: 1) the concern regarding the rate and extent of development and impacts, and 2) the need for, and issues related to, the development of a research program.

The rate and extent of development in a number of sectors are major concerns in the area. Examples included ongoing oil and gas, timber and hydro development, government support for increased development, and increases in non-industrial impacts from trapping, guiding, recreation, pesticides, hunting, and expanding rural and urban populations. These activities and others decrease the land base available to First Nations to sustain their culture and exercise their treaty and Aboriginal rights and mode of life.

Discussion regarding the need to develop a research program was based on the concern that current policy and regulations in regards to CEAs are non-existent. Environmental impact assessments (EIAs) do not and cannot adequately address First Nations' values. Further, there was concern over an underlying assumption implicit in EIAs that new development in association with previous development is assumed to result in small cumulative effects (e.g., following an existing cutline). Generally, government approval for development was described as piece-meal with little or no collaboration between government departments. Concern was expressed that the recent change in the B.C. government could further frustrate the process.

The Treaty 8 First Nations believe that consultation is often an exercise in futility and is indicative of a limited worldview held by the Attorney General's office. Internal bureaucracy within government and industry was identified as a barrier to achieving comprehensive land-use planning and assessing the cumulative and multiple impacts of development. Concern was also expressed regarding industries' dealings with First Nations; each company has a different approach, and often there are too many middle persons between those talking with First Nations people and decision-makers within the company.

The need for a research program that addresses cumulative effects was also related to the First Nations' determination to move forward with agendas to protect their treaty rights. The government was seen as reluctant to distribute existing baseline information and provide access to tools that would contribute to carrying out cumulative effects assessment because of the links to valuation and compensation claims. CEA is an important component in helping to determine compensation claims.

The First Nations representatives identified a number of important criteria in developing a CEA research program. To ensure a First Nation's perspective, the research program must be controlled by First Nations. The project must also be independent from government. Research must address the cumulative effects of all development. There was some discussion about indicators of cumulative effects including: bush medicine, moose (bulls, breeding stock, calves), monetary valuation of individual and collective use, access/roads, seismic lines, fish, water, small animals, community and individual's health, the need for a temporal perspective (seasonal impact), and the need to include traditional knowledge. Overall, the project's outcomes must be practical and applicable, ultimately working towards a mutually acceptable CEA tool for evaluating and analyzing impacts to First Nation's treaty rights and title.

Time was identified as an important factor with respect to a research initiative. Development, particularly oil and gas, moves ahead with monthly changes. The need for research results on identified cumulative effects is immediate. A research program to develop a CEA strategy may take up to 10 to 15 years. Both short- and long-term strategies towards developing a research program were identified as important. The time frames, short, medium and long, were defined as months, couple of years and decade respectively. Consultant-based research was suggested as a means to reach short-term goals. Various approaches to research, such as strategy evaluation and development and research on local cumulative effects, were mentioned as alternative options to meet short-, medium- and long-term objectives. Co-management was identified as a promising avenue to effect change with respect to resource management decision-making.

As an initial step, First Nations should mobilize their ideas and develop a plan prior to the development of a research program. There was some discussion regarding the funding required to support these initial steps. First Nations concluded the discussion by emphasizing the importance of the Treaty. The Treaty was signed in the spirit of sharing, peace, and co-existence. This is the same spirit with which to approach and develop a research program.

The day's discussion was credited for providing an interesting approach to conflict resolution and getting people together to deal with the important issue of cumulative effects. There was expectation that the following day would provide a similar experience with government and industry representatives.

## ***Wednesday, May 16, 2001: Industry, Government, and First Nations Representatives, and Researchers***

### **Welcome and prayer**

Peter Duinker, SFM Network and Dalhousie University, and Stewart Cameron, Sauleau First Nation

### **Workshop background and objectives – see May 15, 2001**

Peter Duinker, SFM Network and Dalhousie University

### **Sustainable Forest Management Network Overview – see May 15, 2001**

Vic Adamowicz, SFM Network Program Leader and University of Alberta

### **Sustainable Aboriginal Communities – Criteria and Indicators Research Area H – see May 15, 2001**

Marc Stevenson, SFM Network First Nations Research Project Coordinator and Liaison

### **T8TA: “Treaty 8 Country”**

The video, produced by T8TA, focused on local issues and concerns regarding development, the future and the spirit of Treaty 8.

### **Introduction and Summary of May 15, Tuesday, 2001**

Stewart Cameron, Sauleau First Nation, and Judy Maas, T8TA

(The following closely paraphrases the speakers' presentations)

When First Nations come to the table to sit down with industry, there is typically fear and distrust regarding industry's motives. There is an expectation that industry is going to 'want it all'. This goes both ways; industry has the same fear regarding First Nation's expectations. We want to cultivate the things that we mutually understand. That is why we have collaborated with SFM Network to bring industry, government and First Nations to the table to get the right people at the table from the start. Our interest is coming to a solution regarding how we can share the land base so that we can continue our way of life and continue with economic development. The way the land is managed causes effects that we all have to live with. CEA is important to do, but it is also creates a challenge.

We contacted SFM Network because it can do multidisciplinary, multi-year research that is required to look at cumulative effects. By themselves, the reserves are not economically viable, but the land is. We need to keep that for our children. Land, culture, language, that's how we identify ourselves. We will always work towards this. We need to respect each other's values, not take away from each other's values. I think this can be done. That is why we are here. These are the objectives that we have, to manage the land respectfully and properly, to manage the land and co-exist. We think that this path, beginning with this workshop, is worth investigating as a possible way to get together to solve problems and meet both our objectives by creating a level playing field.

CEA is a responsibility we all have to devise a meter of what our activities look like on the land. As Aboriginal people who live on the land, we see the changes. By doing cumulative effects research, we can measure where we are heading, and plan and secure a future for us all. We all have a responsibility to secure a future for our children,

and this is about working together to see what alternatives we have, and what we can and cannot do on the land. This approach falls in line with our values and worldview.

Because of our Treaty, we have potential veto power over what happens on the land. But the Treaty also says we have to share our land and resources. So in good faith we share. But we need to share the decision-making with respect to the land and resources. The Treaty does not mean that First Nations have the upper hand. No one has the upper hand. We all have a responsibility towards this Treaty. We are equal here. We need to respect each other. So let us think and work on a solution so we all have a future. I think that is what it is all about.

We have a good start. Yesterday, there were seven First Nations here at the table. That has not occurred in a long time, and it is a real accomplishment to get such complete representation from Treaty 8 First Nations. It shows how important the issue of cumulative effects is to everyone. The First Nations that were here talked about what cumulative effects means to us and how we can move forward while keeping our rights and maintaining our Treaty 8 land base. We talked about our concerns: the rate of industrial, agricultural, residential, and recreational development, the shrinking land base, access, congestion, the impacts on moose (it is our staple food and a priority), the linkage between environmental contamination and human health, the human population, game numbers, First Nations' ability to maintain their way of life on the land, First Nations' frustration on not being involved in land-use planning and decision-making, policies that do not consider our concerns in a mutually beneficial way, and attitudes of inability to make change on both sides.

After the National Energy Board hearing, we have taken the desire for a cumulative effects study to task. Without such a study, decisions are being made with outdated and insufficient data. We do not have the appropriate tools to assess decisions. First Nations, government and industry do not share the same evaluation standards. The focus here is on First Nation issues and values. Traditional knowledge is a vital component to a cumulative effects study. This information must be respected and used in a way that does not reduce its integrity. First Nations must speak for themselves. We know what our needs are and we are the best people to respond to these issues.

Yesterday we looked at some short- (within the next six months), medium- (couple of years), and long-term (10 to 15 years) goals. We need an action plan and research that will meet these goals. We are just starting. A cumulative effects study should be preceded by an action strategy. A comprehensive land-use plan is the most appropriate context for undertaking a CEA strategy. Approaches suggested yesterday that would help to move forward were:

- A project to evaluate CEA strategies and develop and test a composite CEA strategy.
- Undertake research directly on local cumulative effects.
- A visioning exercise for First Nations jointly to set long-term goals for the land, and shorter-term objectives.

### **Cumulative Effects Assessment within the Federal Environmental Assessment Process**

John Mathers, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency  
(The following closely paraphrases the speaker's presentation)

CEA falls within the federal environmental assessment (EA) process. EAs serve to ensure consideration of environmental effects, pursuit of sustainable development, prevention of significant adverse environmental effects on outside jurisdictions, and public participation in the EA process.

EAs are triggered under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* if a Federal authority:

- proposes a project,
- grants money to a project,
- grants an interest in federal land (such as reserve or traditional land) to a project,
- exercises a regulatory duty in relation to a project (Law List).

CEA is a requirement of, and is defined within, the *Act*:

“...every screening or comprehensive study of a project and every mediation or assessment by a review panel shall include a consideration of...the environmental effects of the project including...cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects or activities that have been or will be carried out.” Section 16(1)(a).

There is no definition for ‘cumulative effects’ under the *Act*, but there is a definition for ‘environmental effects’. Where there is an environmental effect, there is a requirement to look at the cumulative effects of any environmental effects. As defined under the *Act*, an environmental effect is:

- a) “ any change that the project may cause in the environment, including any effect of any such change on health and socio-economic conditions, on physical and cultural heritage on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes by aboriginal persons, or on any structure, site or thing that is of historical, archaeological, paleontological or architectural significance, and
- b) any change to the project that may be caused the environment, whether any such change occurs within or outside Canada”.

So, for any EA if any one of these environmental effects occurs, the effects must be evaluated to see how they might add up with those of other projects or activities that have been, or will be, carried out.

After an EA is completed, one of the following determinations must be made. Before a project, permit, or grant can be approved, one of three conclusions must be reached after looking at the environmental effects and evaluating if these environmental effects can be mitigated:

- the project is not likely to cause significant adverse effects
- the project is likely to cause significant adverse effects which cannot be justified in the circumstances
- the project is likely to cause significant adverse effects which can be justified in the circumstances.

To summarize, for each EA that is triggered (some five or six thousand in Canada) cumulative effects must be considered, and a decision reached on the significance of the effects.

To develop a standard approach towards CEA, the CEAA has published a number of documents. In particular, the *1999 Practitioners Guide* provides a starting point, setting out the best practices and practical ways of doing CEA. Input into developing this guide came from government, universities, industry, and consultants, and from public consultation. The guide sets out a five-step assessment framework that is relevant to any EA legislation. The key audience is the practitioner, with a focus on biophysical effects and large projects, and basic EA approaches and principles. The *Practitioners Guide* is available, free of charge, from CEAA's website: [www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca](http://www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca). The CEAA also offers services in the form of a two-day CEA workshop (approximately 20 people are

required, and there is an associated charge, with provisions for First Nations).  
Inquiries can be directed to:

The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency  
Training Coordinator  
13th Floor Fontaine Building  
200 Sacré-Coeur Blvd.  
Hull, Quebec, K1A 0H3  
Telephone: 819-953-2530 / Fax: 819-997-4931  
e-mail: [training/formation@ceaa.gc.ca](mailto:training/formation@ceaa.gc.ca)

### **Q&A following CEEA presentation**

In response to the CEEA presentation, a number of concerns were raised by First Nation's representatives:

- There is no working definition for CEA provided under the *Act*.
- The CEA under the *Act* does not account for Aboriginal Treaty rights
- The use of resources and land by Aboriginal people is narrowly defined in the *Act* as "...*traditional* (added italics) purposes..." which may not be inclusive of modern purpose and/or a moderate livelihood as defined by Aboriginal rights and supported by *Delgamuukw v R* (1997, SCC) and *Marshall v R* (1999, SCC).
- To avoid infringement on areas of provincial jurisdictions, some projects are spatially scoped too narrowly to account for cumulative effects beyond the project site. This problem may be resolved in the future when federal and provincial legislation is harmonized. There are also issues with projects being scoped too narrowly over time and failing to account fully for the seasonal impacts from development.
- EA processes do not explicitly account for the role of traditional Aboriginal knowledge. However, changes to the *Act*, following a recent five-year review, have made a small step towards the recognition of such knowledge. The *Act* now explicitly states that 'community' and 'Aboriginal traditional knowledge' may be considered in environmental assessment, where before recognition was more implicit.

### **Discussion: Industry and Government Perspective**

Following a summary of the previous afternoon's discussion, the workshop proceeded with First Nations, researchers, industry, government and SFMN representatives at the table.

Several research initiatives by timber companies were identified. One current and related initiative is a pilot project, the *Sustainable Forest Management Plan* (part of B.C.'s Results Based Code Pilots Program). This joint project, involving Slocan, Canfor, Louisiana-Pacific and the B.C. Ministry of Forests, looks at the cumulative impacts of timber harvesting in the Fort Saint John forest region (4.8 million ha). A map has been produced that shows the historical, current and proposed harvest blocks of all companies operating in the area. The map will help the forest industry in seeking CSA certification, to plan for cumulative effects and coordinate planning by forest companies, and to inform the process of regulation development.

The pilot project applicants (the forest industry) must account for biological, First Nations, social and economic indicators when applying for CSA certification. However, the opportunity to manage better for cumulative effects is missed since the CSA SFM

standard is unclear about joint application between industries (i.e., forestry and oil and gas) with shared responsibility for meeting standards.

The B.C. Ministry of Forests discussed the government's Land and Resource Management Planning (LRMP)<sup>1</sup> as a process to address cumulative effects. The LRMP for the Fort Saint John region was completed in 1997, and the forest component of these plans has been approved. However, First Nations noted the lack of capacity, human resources, and the total disregard paid to their treaty and Aboriginal rights in the initial planning process. Therefore First Nations felt they had no choice but to withdraw from any participation in the decision-making process of the LRMP.

The possibility of teaming the proposed CEA strategy research with an existing initiative was discussed. This was not considered for the LRMP process since levels of land use were already established in the planning process (in which First Nations and environmental NGOs did not take part). The potential of teaming up with the Sustainable Forest Management Plan pilot project was discussed. Concern was expressed over the possibility that the CEA research proposal might be overshadowed by the original project's objectives.

Linking the CEA agenda into a process that is already predetermined would not be considered since it has a number of major problems:

- Linking onto an existing project would not capture what the new CEA initiative wants to define in terms of principles, objectives and goals.
- Too many agendas could bog down the process and dilute effectiveness for all initiatives.
- Defining a new initiative for the CEA research would ensure 100% support by those involved.
- Outcomes from existing projects could be reviewed for potential contributions to a newly defined CEA project and agenda.

During the afternoon's discussion, several additional concerns were expressed regarding a partnership involvement in a cumulative effects research agenda:

- The degree to which it is agreed that final decisions are based on traditional knowledge, western science, or some combination of the two.
- The difficulty of defining values that change over time, and managing for multiple sets of values.
- The importance of recognizing thresholds and dimensions of risk to both natural and human systems.

The afternoon session concluded with a discussion of the various research initiatives that could occur, and on the general needs of a large research program. First Nations participants emphasized the importance of timeliness in the research program. Although it is recognized that a full-scale CEA research program is a long-term commitment, First Nations require immediate information on cumulative effects to assist an ongoing political agenda. Before any research could occur, the First Nations would have to meet, in the form of a 'visioning exercise', whereby community members could be informed and included in the initiative, and principles and objectives of First Nation's involvement

---

<sup>1</sup> Land and resource management planning (LRMP): an integrated sub-regional consensus-based process requiring public participation that produces a land and resource management plan for review and approval by government. The plan establishes direction for land use and specifies broad resource management objectives and strategies (<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/planning/RPGLOSS/L.htm>, July 9, 2001).

clearly identified. The following table shows some of the initiatives suggested, the time frame involved, and the SFM Network's role.

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>SFM Network role</b>
First Nations visioning exercise	Short term	Facilitation
CEA training workshop	Short term	Design/instruction
Small CEA pilot projects per First Nation	Short to mid-long term	Research component
Project on CEA strategy	Mid-long term	Lead research design and implementation
Implement CEA strategy	Long term	Do some of the assessment of research
First Nation involvement in existing projects	Immediate and ongoing	None

The basic needs of any research program were identified as:

- Broad range of buy-in and cooperation
- Funding and resources
- Capacity to contribute
- Leadership: "champion of the cause"

The last of these, the individual(s) to drive the process, was identified as most important. The next day's discussion would focus on the steps that need to be taken towards a CEA research project and identifying potential leaders for a CEA strategy project.

### ***Thursday, May 17, 2001: SFM Network Researchers and Staff and Treaty 8 and First Nation Representatives***

The issue of timing was a key topic of the morning's discussion. Time is required to develop and submit a proposal, and get the Treaty 8 communities on board and comfortable with the selected principal investigators and co-investigators. This could take up to a year or more, and could be completed prior to the next SFM Network call for proposals (2003/04).

The First Nations representatives agreed that a visioning exercise for Treaty 8 community members was necessary for the success of a research initiative. The community members need to be informed and a relationship developed between the organizations and researchers involved. Representation from SFM Network at the visioning exercise is necessary to provide information on the research as well as to build a relationship of trust. The visioning exercise should be preceded by a series of community workshops to inform people of the desire and need for such research. From this a committee of people, assisted by Elders, should be identified based on their interest in the project. Once people have had time to think about the issues, the visioning exercise could take place to discuss any concerns and ideas amongst those interested and involved.

Marc Stevenson, SFM Network First Nations Research Project Coordinator, agreed to work with Leon Sadownik, T8TA, to identify funding required for the visioning exercise. The estimated cost of a First Nations CE project coordinator, seven workshops, associated travel, production of research proposal and honorariums is \$35,000. The SFM Network has since committed personnel time (20 persons days for Principal Researcher and First Nations Research Project Coordinator) and travel funds (ca. \$10,000) to participate with the T8TA in conducting a visioning exercise with Treaty 8 First Nations. The visioning exercise is expected to be completed in fall, 2001.

The SFM Network was charged with identifying a small cohort of potential principal investigators, and collaborating with First Nations in the selection of researchers for the project. The researcher(s) should attend the visioning exercise, to initiate a relationship with the communities. Researchers from the main institutions of Simon Fraser University, University of Victoria, University of British Columbia, University of Northern British Columbia, University of Calgary and University of Alberta were considered due to their proximity to the Treaty 8 area. T8TA representatives agreed to continue to investigate funding opportunities for research to meet short-term goals and for the visioning exercise.

***Update: Sept 12, 2001***

- SFM Network has contacted Dr. John Innis, University of BC. Dr. Innis has expressed interest in helping define, and conduct, a research agenda as a potential principal investigator.
- An Aboriginal Co-coordinator from the Treaty 8 area remains to be selected.
- T8TA has had difficulty in identifying and securing funding to support community meetings and a visioning exercise.
- Several potential sources of funding are being investigated: the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Since mid-August, a number of the Treaty 8 First Nations have blockaded roads in protest of oil and gas activities by Petro-Canada, Anadarko Petroleum, and Canadian Natural Resources Limited (CNRL). Local human resources have thus been reduced for working on community dialogue towards a CEA strategy. A visioning exercise has yet to be conducted.

## Workshop Participants

<p>Aasen, Wendy          First Nations Studies          University of Northern British Columbia          3333 University Way          Prince George, BC V2M 4Z9          Ph. 250-960-5839          Fax. 250-960-6330  <a href="mailto:aasenw@unbc.ca">aasenw@unbc.ca</a></p>	<p>Adamowicz, Vic          Program Leader          Sustainable Forest Management Network          B208 Biological Sciences          University of Alberta          Edmonton, AB T6G 2E9          Ph. 780-492-3625          Fax. 780-492-8160  <a href="mailto:vic.adamowicz@ualberta.ca">vic.adamowicz@ualberta.ca</a></p>
<p>Barth, Ken          Land Use Assessment Officer          Fort Nelson First Nation          RR #1 Mile 293 Alaska Hwy          Fort Nelson, BC V0C 1R0          Ph. 250-774-7257          Fax. 250-774-7260</p>	<p>Beale, Jeff          Slokan, Tackama Division          RR#1          Fort Nelson, BC V0C 1R0          Ph. 250-261-6464  <a href="mailto:jbeale@fn.slocan.com">jbeale@fn.slocan.com</a></p>
<p>Burgess, Bill          Councillor          West Moberly First Nation          P.O. Box 90          Moberly Lake, BC V0C 1X0          Ph. 250-788-3663          Fax. 250-788-9792  <a href="mailto:WMBurgess29@hotmail.com">WMBurgess29@hotmail.com</a></p>	<p>Cameron, Stewart          Saulteau First Nation          P.O. Box 414          Chetwynd, BC V0C 1J0          Ph. 250-788-3955          Fax. 250-788-9158</p>
<p>Cruniski, Orest          Dene Tsa'a Tse K'Nai (Prophet River) First Nation          Route 233 Alaska Hwy          Box 3250          Fort Nelson, BC V0C 1R0          Ph. 250-773-6555          Fax. 250-773-6556</p>	<p>Davidson, Debra          Environmental Sociologist          University of Alberta          Department of Rural Economy          543 General Services Building          University of Alberta          Edmonton, AB T6G 2H1          Ph. 780-492-4598          Fax. 780-492-0268  <a href="mailto:debra.davidson@ualberta.ca">debra.davidson@ualberta.ca</a></p>
<p>Desjarlais, Steven          Councillor          West Moberly First Nation          P.O. Box 90          Moberly Lake, BC V0C 1X0          Ph. 250-788-3663          Fax. 250-788-9792</p>	<p>deVries, Andrew          Biologist/First Nations Coordinator          Canadian Forest Products Ltd.          Canfor Peace Region 4700 50 St.          Box 180 Chetwynd, BC V0C 1J0          Ph. 250-788-4358          Fax. 250-788-4310  <a href="mailto:adevries@mail.canfor.ca">adevries@mail.canfor.ca</a></p>
<p>Duinker, Peter          Network Research Area Leader          Sustainable Forest Management Network          School for Resource and Environmental Studies          Dalhousie University          1312 Robie St.          Halifax, NS B3H 3J5          Ph. 902-494-7100          Fax. 902-494-3728  <a href="mailto:peter.duinker@dal.ca">peter.duinker@dal.ca</a></p>	<p>Enzsol, Trent          BP Canada Energy Co. Ltd.          240 4 Ave. S.W.          P.O. Box 200          Calgary, AB T2P SH8          Ph. 403-233-1378          Fax. 403-233-5610</p>

<p>Gray, Jarvis Senior Aboriginal Program Specialist B.C. Oil and Gas Commission Suite 200, 10003 110<sup>th</sup> Ave. Fort Saint John, B.C. V1J 6M7 Ph. 250-261-5752 Fax. 250-261-5750 <a href="mailto:Jarvis.Gray@gems3.gov.bc.ca">Jarvis.Gray@gems3.gov.bc.ca</a></p>	<p>Hannibal-Paci, Christopher First Nations Studies University of Northern British Columbia 3333 University Way Prince George, BC V2M 4Z9 Ph. 250-960-5304 Fax. 250-960-6330 <a href="mailto:hannibac@unbc.ca">hannibac@unbc.ca</a></p>
<p>Harvey, Gabe Doig River First Nation P.O. Box 56 Rose Prairie, BC V0C 2H0 Ph. 250-827-3304 Fax. 250-827-3778</p>	<p>Korber, Dianne Research Coordinator Sustainable Forest Management Network G208 Biological Sciences University of Alberta Edmonton, AB T6E 2E9 Ph. 780-492-5714 Fax. 780-492-8160 <a href="mailto:dkorber@ualberta.ca">dkorber@ualberta.ca</a></p>
<p>LaLond, Rhenie Councillor West Moberly First Nation P.O. Box 90 Moberly Lake, BC V0C 1X0 Ph. 250-788-3663 Fax. 250-788-9792</p>	<p>Lawrence, Ben Aboriginal Liaison Communications Officer B.C. Oil and Gas Commission Suite 200, 10003 110<sup>th</sup> Ave. Fort Saint John, B.C. V1J 6M7 Ph. 250-261-5737 Fax. 250-261-5750 <a href="mailto:Ben.Lawrence@gems2.gov.bc.ca">Ben.Lawrence@gems2.gov.bc.ca</a></p>
<p>Lilly, Bernice Halfway River First Nation P.O. Box 59 Wonowon, BC V0C 2N0 Ph. 250-772-5058 Fax. 250-772-5200</p>	<p>Maas, Judy Treaty 8 Tribal Association 10233 100th Ave. Fort Saint John, BC V1J 1Y8 Ph. 250-785-0612 Fax. 250-785-2021 <a href="mailto:judy_morningstar@hotmail.com">judy_morningstar@hotmail.com</a></p>
<p>Madill, Howard Operations Manager LIM B.C. Ministry of Forests Fort Saint John Forest District Ph. 250-787-5623 Fax. 250-787-5610 <a href="mailto:Howard.Madill@gems6.gov.bc.ca">Howard.Madill@gems6.gov.bc.ca</a></p>	<p>Mathers, John Senior Program Officer Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency Vancouver Regional Office Suite 320 Sinclair Centre 757 West Hastings St. Vancouver, BC V6C 1A1 Ph. 604-666-6961 Fax. 604-666-6990 <a href="mailto:John.Mathers@ceaa.gc.ca">John.Mathers@ceaa.gc.ca</a></p>
<p>Morrison, Andrea Liaison Officer, Aboriginal Affairs B.C. Ministry of Forests 8808 72 Street Fort Saint John, B.C. V1J 6M2 Ph. 250-787-5606 <a href="mailto:Andrea.Morison@gems9.gov.bc.ca">Andrea.Morison@gems9.gov.bc.ca</a></p>	<p>Prest, Gordon First Nations Program Coordinator University of British Columbia Forest Science Centre 2613 University of British Columbia Ph. 604-822-0651 Fax. 604-822-8645 <a href="mailto:prest@interchange.ubc.ca">prest@interchange.ubc.ca</a></p>

<p>Sadownik, Leon  Director Environment and Land Resources  Treaty 8 Tribal Association  10233 100<sup>th</sup> Ave.  Fort Saint John, B.C.  V1J 1Y8  Ph. 250-785-0612  Fax. 250-785-2021  t8taland@awink.com</p>	<p>Seips, Dale  Wildlife Habitat Ecologist  B.C. Ministry of Forests  1011 4<sup>th</sup> Ave  Prince George, B.C.  V2L 3H9  Ph. 250-565-6224  Fax. 250-565-6671  Dale.Seips@gems3.gov.bc.ca</p>
<p>Deborah Smithson  Director of Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research  Program  Treaty 8 Tribal Association  10233 100<sup>th</sup> Ave.  Fort Saint John, B.C.  V1J 1Y8  Ph. 250-785-0612  Fax. 250-785-2021  T8tatarr @awink.com</p>	<p>Southwell, Howard  Forestry Manager  Blueberry River First Nation  10071 100th Ave.  Fort Saint John, BC V1J 1Y7  Ph. 250-785-5414  Fax. 250-630-2588</p>
<p>Stevenson, Marc  First Nations Coordinator  Sustainable Forest Management Network  B208 Biological Sciences University of Alberta  Edmonton, AB T6G 2E9  Ph. 780-492-2476  Fax. 780-492-8160  mgs1@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca</p>	<p>Waito, Barry  Aboriginal Relations  Louisiana-Pacific Canada Ltd.  Forest Resources Div.  P.O. Box 998  Swan River, MB R0L 1Z0  Ph. 204-734-4102  Fax. 204-734-9689  Barry.Waito@LPCorp.com</p>
<p>Wolf, Liza  Chief Dene Tsaa Tse K'nai First Nation  Dene Tsaa Tse K'Nai (Prophet River)First Nation  Route 233 Alaska Hwy  Box 3250  Fort Nelson, BC V0C 1R0  Ph. 250-773-6555  Fax. 250-773-6556</p>	



## Framework for Assessing Forest Management Alternatives

**Development of Strategies, Tools, and Policy Analysis**

		Strategies / Alternatives						
		Natural Disturbance	"Business as Usual"	Natural Disturbance Management	Intensive Forest Management / TRIAD	Integrated Resource Management	Policy / Institutions	Value Added / Alternative Products
<b>Criteria &amp; Indicators</b>	Ecology (Biodiversity, Ecosystem Productivity, Global Cycles)	<b>SFMN Historical Research Focus</b>						
	Water / Wetlands							
	Sustainable Aboriginal Communities							
	Economy and Society							

**Monitoring Strategies / Indicator Development**

## Industrial Partner, Aboriginal and Scientific Research Locations

### Aboriginal Research Objectives

Our goal is to achieve all four objectives in all four geographic locations

1. Integration of Aboriginal institutions, knowledge and values.
2. Accommodation of Aboriginal and treaty rights.
3. Aboriginal economics and capacity development.
4. Aboriginal criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management.

