

## **Lunn, Kristin E ENV:EX**

---

**From:** Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
**Sent:** Fri, December 8, 2006 9:17 AM  
**To:** Lunn, Kristin E ENV:EX  
**Subject:** Fw: Next response

I'll send another note for context

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Wilkin, Nancy ENV:EX  
**To:** Martin, Al D ENV:EX; Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
**Sent:** Thu Dec 07 16:11:33 2006  
**Subject:** Next response

I would like to take the minister's suggestion this time and list the highlights and benefits to residents of the policy and the overall benefits of the policy in the response letter - we are not out there yet in writing on these and that leaves the naysayers a huge opening to continue the non-fact based discussion. Yes I'm upset with the tone of their letter and the lack of accountability on their part for wasting all last year! Nancy

## Lunn, Kristin E ENV:EX

---

**From:** Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
**Sent:** May 29, 2006 12:05 PM  
'wilf pfleiderer'; 'Dale Drown'; 'Les Husband'; 'Eric Mikkelson'; Ackerman, Andy ENV:EX; 'B&H Frederick'; 'David F. Hatler'  
**Cc:** Wilkin, Nancy ENV:EX; Martin, Al D ENV:EX; Lunn, Kristin E ENV:EX; Sandiford, Peter B ENV:EX  
**Subject:** Allocation Meeting, May 31st - Agenda  
**Importance:** High

Greetings All,

Please find attached the agenda for the allocation policy meeting **Wednesday, May 31st** in the **Blanshard Room** at **Holiday Inn Victoria, 3020 Blanshard Street**. Information for booking hotel rooms is provided on the Agenda and summarized below.

Also is the latest harvest allocations based on the decision rules in the draft policy.

### **Booking a hotel room:**

Location: 3020 Blanshard Street, Victoria BC

Phone: 250-382-4400 (1-888-465-4329)

Details:

1. Book soon - rooms are not blocked off.
2. Ask for the **Provincial** Government rate (\$95.00/night + tax)
3. If you have any problems getting this rate - send me an email ([peter.sandiford@gov.bc.ca](mailto:peter.sandiford@gov.bc.ca))
4. If you choose to stay elsewhere, we can only reimburse up to \$95.00/night.

Looking forward to seeing you and having a productive meeting. (Les please forward to Andy P.)

regards,

Tom Ethier

---

Assistant Director  
Fish and Wildlife Branch  
Environmental Stewardship Division  
Ministry of Environment  
Tel: (250) 387-5657  
<mailto:tom.ethier@gov.bc.ca>



DRAFT ONLY Agenda\_31May0  
location - end nu 6.doc (33 KB)

## **Big Game Harvest Allocation: Meeting Agenda**

***May 31, 2006***

***Blanshard Room, Holiday Inn***

***3020 Blanshard, Victoria, BC***

8:45 am	Coffee
9:00 am	Welcome and Introduction (Nancy Wilkin)
9:15 am	Overview of Allocation Policy Review Process (Tom Ethier)
10:00 am	Discussion of Outstanding Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- BCWF</li><li>- GOABC</li><li>- BCTA</li></ul>
12:00 pm	Lunch
1:00 pm	Discussion of Outstanding Issues ( <i>cont.</i> )
2:30 pm	Coffee
2:45 pm	Review of Action Points
4:00 pm	Wrap-Up

### **Hotel Contact Info:**

3020 Blanshard Street

1-888-465-4329

1-250-382-4400

[info@hivictoria.ca](mailto:info@hivictoria.ca)

**Rates:** We have been quoted the government rate of \$95.00/night, and will cover up to this amount for participants.

### **Meeting Info:**

Blanshard Room

Booked under: Ministry of Environment

## Vouriot, Harmony ENV:EX

---

**From:** Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
**Sent:** Tue, November 28, 2006 3:36 PM  
**To:** Wilkin, Nancy ENV:EX; Martin, Al D ENV:EX  
**Subject:** BCW Fedallocation resp

**Attachments:** Response to BCWF\_1Dec06.doc; 87517 - Langeegger - Fish and Wildlife Policies.doc

Nancy/Al,

Attached is a response to their requests/demands for Dec 1 at noon. Maybe we could talk about this quickly tomorrow? I have included a letter that MBP sent to Mike Langeegger (Director in Skeena) which references the no commercial areas. As far as I am concerned this is Ministry policy, and it will be operationalized in the next and final chapter of Allocation P&P.



Response to 87517 -  
WF\_1Dec06.doc (egger - Fish and

Wilf Pfleiderer  
BC Wildlife Federation  
101-3060 Norland Avenue  
Burnaby, BC  
V5B 3A6

December 1, 2006

Dear Wilf,

Thank you for your letter of November 23, 2006, regarding the implementation of the Harvest Allocation Policy and Procedure.

We value the working relationship that we have built with your organization and appreciate the support you have provided throughout the Harvest Allocation Policy review. The purpose of the Harvest Allocation Policy Review was to focus on the development of a new and more consistent approach to making allocation decisions province-wide, while recognizing that other policies and procedures would be needed to support its outcomes. As we work through the implementation phase of the Harvest Allocation Policy, we are committed to the following:

- *Review of Regulations.* The Ministry is in the process of preparing a Big Game Harvest Management Policy and Procedure. These documents will include general principles about harvest management (e.g. ethics, safety) and outline the way in which regulations will be developed and maintained. Harvest management rules will be built into the procedure in order to provide staff with clear guidance about regulatory reviews. For example, a regulation review may be triggered:
  - At the end of each five-year period;
  - If residents take <60% of the total harvest in a particular species and region;
  - If Limited Entry Hunting (LEH) odds reach >20:1; and/or
  - In other situations suggested by the BCWF, or resident hunters generally.
- *Review of Unallocated Areas.* In previous correspondence from our Minister to members of your organization, we have stated that commercial hunters would be excluded from certain areas of the province to which resident hunters have access. Although the status of unallocated areas is to be reviewed in 2007, this policy directive remains and will be included in our Policy Manual as guidance for staff. That is, resident hunters will continue to have exclusive access to some areas of the province for hunting and will be a founding block in the proposed review.
- *Review of Spatial Application of Allocation Decisions.* Allocation decisions will be applied at the Management Unit (M.U.) level in all but two regions of the province during the implementation phase. Our goal is to apply allocation decisions at the M.U. level in all regions, following this initial transition period (2007-11).

- *Including Points from Correspondence in Regulatory Reform Policy.* As stated in point 1 above (Review of Regulations), we are committing (in writing) to the creation of a policy and procedure to address the issue of regulatory reform. Moving hunts to General Open Season will be a priority for us, provided that these seasons can be sustained given our conservation and harvest objectives (e.g. First Nations' interests).
- *Resident Demand.* During the transition period (2007-11), we will look at other ways of measuring resident demand. For example, the introduction of e-licensing may facilitate this review.

Thank you again for your continued support and for the assistance of your organization throughout this policy review.

Yours sincerely,

Nancy Wilkin

cc Barry Penner, Minister of Environment  
cc Shane Simpson, Opposition, Environment Critic  
cc Al Martin, Director of Fish & Wildlife  
cc Tom Ethier, Assistant Director of Fish & Wildlife  
cc MLAs  
cc BCWF Membership

Date typed: April 5, 2006

File: 280-30

Reference: 87517

Mike Langegger

Email: s. 22

Dear Mr Langegger:

Thank you for your letter outlining the importance of protecting resident priority in hunting and angling activities.

The Ministry certainly appreciates the important role that resident hunters play in the conservation and management of wildlife and their habitats. As you know, we conduct extensive consultations on virtually all of our regulation and policy changes through the Provincial Hunting Regulations Advisory Committee and other less formal discussions throughout the year. This process has been extremely valuable in maintaining an ongoing dialogue amongst users and managers, in order to ensure that each party's interests are being addressed.

Consultation with user groups has been a key element of the Wildlife Allocation Policy Review, which was initiated to address the current policy's lack of transparency and consistency with respect to the issues discussed in your letter. A provincial allocation policy review committee with representatives from the BC Wildlife Federation, the Guide Outfitter Association of BC, the BC Trappers Association, and Ministry staff was formed to examine existing policy and make recommendations for improvement. The BC Wildlife Federation and the Guide Outfitters Association of BC have been equally involved in the process. The Ministry is aware of, and is striving to address, the interests of both groups.

The allocation policy review committee adopted a number of guiding principles, two of which are:

- a. Resident hunters have priority over non-resident hunters, and
- b. The Ministry is supportive of the guide outfitting industry consistent with other management objectives.

The goal has been to develop appropriate shares for resident hunters and commercial guides based on their past utilization and the relative importance of the resource to that residency group.

Resident priority has been defined in the proposed policy, entrenching it into the allocation process and ensuring its place in allocation decisions of the future. Resident priority means that resident opportunities to hunt big game take precedence over the commercial hunting opportunities. This will be achieved by:

- Excluding commercial hunters from certain areas of the province to which residents have access;

- Allocating residents the vast majority of harvestable big game animals in the province; and
- Finding ways to increase resident hunter numbers and success including:
  - Regulating commercial harvest differently than resident harvest, and
  - Charging lower prices to resident hunters for hunting opportunities.

I remind you that the policy and procedures apply to allocation of big game species only. Only those big game species for which harvest limits have been determined will be allocated. As such, the policy applies to a very small percentage of animals in the province. In addition to having priority to these big game species, resident hunters continue to harvest the majority of other species in the province.

The Ministry's commitment to the guiding industry has been a policy objective since 1984. It was not developed as a result of this review process. Please be assured that the commitment to the guiding industry is within the limits posed by other management objectives, including resident priority.

With respect to your comments about commercial wildlife viewing tenures, new applicants and tenure holders have been required (since approximately 2004) to submit a Commercial Recreation Management Plan to the regional Ministry of Tourism, Sport, and the Arts office. This responsibility was, previously, under Land & Water BC. In the case of bear viewing, a specific Bear Viewing Management Plan is also required. Bear Viewing Management Plans have been guided by the draft guidelines that were prepared by the Ministry of Environment. In addition, all commercial recreation tenure applicants are directed to the Ministry of Environment's web links for identifying wildlife values which may overlap with the application area and which they must subsequently address in their general management plan.

In the Skeena Region, there are several tenure holders that participate in bear viewing and have Bear Viewing Management Plans in place. Any concerns or issues regarding compliance of specific tenure holders with their management plans should be directed to the regional Adventure Tourism Manager of the Ministry of Tourism, Sport, and the Arts for follow-up.

Thank you again for your interest in these matters.

Sincerely,

Barry Penner  
Minister

KLUNN/mflett

bcc: Minister's Office



## **Lunn, Kristin E ENV:EX**

---

**From:** Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
**Sent:** Wed, November 22, 2006 9:16 AM  
**To:** Wilkin, Nancy ENV:EX  
**Cc:** Martin, Al D ENV:EX; Lunn, Kristin E ENV:EX  
**Subject:** Re: Alloc

Thanks. I talked to Al and he is fine wioth this approach. Kristin and I are working on this and will have a draft later this morning.. I'll run it past Al before I bring it to you. I am also visiting with Ray D this morning regarding stone sheep.

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Wilkin, Nancy ENV:EX  
**To:** Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
**Sent:** Wed Nov 22 08:44:50 2006  
**Subject:** Alloc

Hi - I will sign - discussed with the minister and he agrees. I have to leave my office today at 145 pm to catch ferry so a bit tight. I see Al's in Penticton - you'll have to talk to him about the steelheadpiece - no mention of retention - just better science and inventoru leading to review of the policy provincially - best practices type language.  
Nancy

## Lunn, Kristin E ENV:EX

---

From: Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
Sent: Fri, November 17, 2006 1:50 PM  
To: Lunn, Kristin E ENV:EX  
Subject: Fw: allocation policy

----- Original Message -----  
From: Wilkin, Nancy ENV:EX  
To: Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
Sent: Fri Nov 17 13:46:06 2006  
Subject: Fw: allocation policy

You might suggest that Andy or Kent be included by conf call on Monday. Nancy. Ps - eerie silence from guides - they must be talking to their lawyers!! Nancy

----- Original Message -----  
From: Andy < s.22  
To: Ethier, Tom ENV:EX  
Cc: Martin, Al D ENV:EX; Penner.MLA, Barry LASS:EX; Wilkin, Nancy ENV:EX  
Sent: Fri Nov 17 12:18:49 2006  
Subject: allocation policy

Tom:  
Thank you for your work and the dedication of your staff over the last year or more in the allocation review process. I participated in this a regional representative on the BCWF allocation committee, and even though some information leaks resulted in some bad publicity for the policy being developed, I myself did not lose hope that an equitable policy would be developed in the end. Each time a new draft of the policies and procedures was released they looked a little better, and I was sure that given time and effort, that the BCWF concerns would eventually be adequately addressed.

I have to say that I was stunned when I read the final drafts accompanying your letter of Nov 10th. While I noted that resident minimum share was increased to 50% over the previous 40%, I also noted the loss of the bullet in the Resident Priority Policy that assured that some resident only exclusive hunting areas would be maintained. I also was surprised to see the new paragraph added to the Harvest Allocation Procedure, Appendix B, that will allow regional managers to increase the non-resident share by 50% above the calculated allocation in a MU in order to meet a regional allocation decision. I have always believed that the allocation policy did not apply to unallocated or untenured areas since there was really no allocation decision regarding the AAH in those areas, and thus a regional allocation decision would only be applied to the allocated areas with a region. If this were true the regional allocation decision would always be met when allocation percentages were applied by MU and there would be no need for this. This represents an increase in non-resident allocation in allocated areas due to the fact that there may be unallocated or resident only hunting areas within a region. This indirectly negates any benefit to resident hunters from the existence of such areas, which were at one time (previous draft) considered to be part of the Resident Priority package.

Considering these major changes that we did not anticipate, negotiate, agree to, or even have a chance to review, it turns out that this is the first time a new draft actually represents a step "further away" from a fair and unbiased policy for resident hunters instead of a step forward as previous drafts were. This final draft is much more unacceptable from a resident hunter point of view than the previous draft was!

I am very disappointed Tom. I cannot help but feel that I wasted a lot of valuable time on this review, and that the concerns of resident hunters were not heard, and in fact appear to have been placed at a lower priority than the concerns of the GOABC. After careful review of these final drafts Tom, I think it's only fair to inform you that my personal recommendation within the BCWF must at this time be to adamantly oppose the implementation this new policy

Andy Pezderic  
East Kootenay (sub-region) Allocation Committee.