

Wildlife Allocation and Use Program Policy Meeting
May 3, 2007-05-03

In attendance:

Region 1: Karen Morrison, Kim Brunt

Victoria: Ian Hatter, Tim Irvin

Rehabilitation and release of Schedule C wildlife:

- Karen is sending out letters to Wildarc and Island Wildlife Natural Care Centre (IWNCC) reminding them of the conditions of their respective permits.
- Wildarc will be permitted to release non-native Schedule C wildlife as well as sterilized grey squirrels for this season only.
- IWNCC will be reminded that a condition of their permit is that they are not to release non-native Schedule C wildlife.
- These actions are seen as interim measures until the captive wildlife policy is reviewed providing sound policy on this issue for the entire province.
- Tim will coordinate a Workshop to discuss the release of non-native Schedule C species.
- Staff from Regions 1 and 2, a representative from the executive of the Wildlife Rehabilitators Network of BC and various members of the rehabilitation community will be invited to the workshop.
- The workshop will serve as a brain-storming session, providing ideas and options for this specific issue to be used within the larger captive wildlife policy review.
- Location and dates TBA.

Impact assessment of Wildlife Allocation Policy on Guide Outfitting Industry

Purposes:

- 1) defining and measuring the viability of the guide outfitting industry and assessing the economic impacts of the policy on that industry
- 2) What is government's role (if any) to mitigate the impact of this policy and maintain a viable guide outfitting industry
- 3) Science and ethics (morals) of hunting viewed wildlife populations
 - a. effects (if any) of habituation to humans through viewing (no negative re-enforcement) then, once wildlife are used to humans, hunting them.

Brainstorming

What does government deem a "viable industry"?

Performance measures for industry:

of clients

\$ / hunt

Net revenue of GO industry

Access to clients

Availability of wildlife

Access to wildlife

Client demographics

\$ sent to HTC and other conservation initiatives

Average income of guide outfitters (net and gross)

Is any region hit harder by the policy than others (because of changes in AAH, popn est, harvest rates)? If so, what do we need to do to mitigate the impact?

What is our role in mitigating the impacts of this policy on the guide outfitting industry?

What opportunities do guide outfitters have in BC that are not offered elsewhere?

Why government wants the guide outfitting industry to remain viable (benefits of hunting).

- conservation efforts
- responsible hunting practices (hunter education – teaching a new generation)
- ecosystem stewardship

Which GOs were impacted by what factors?

How much do GOs need to be impacted by the new policy for us to mitigate that impact?

How many factors (or what factors) should be included in this process?

Alternatives:

- wildlife viewing (conflict? – habituation)
 - lots of research on bear viewing (especially grizzly bear viewing)
 - bit of research on elk and moose viewing
- fishing
- outdoor recreation
- photography (conflict? – habituation)

-what other guides are doing to supplement their hunting incomes

- fishing
- wildlife viewing and photography
- outdoor recreation (hiking, camping, boating, ATVing)

IMPLICATIONS OF VIEWING AND HUNTING (conflict of interest?)

-no conflict of interest if:

- no hunting zone established greater than 500km² surrounding the viewing platforms (Rode, Farley & Robbins, 2006)
- wildlife viewing occurs from specific sites that are well-regulated
- human behaviour is consistent at viewing platform sites
- wildlife are not followed or stalked for viewing advantage
-

Structured Decision Making

Defining the problem:

1. What impact does the new Wildlife Allocation Policy have on the guide outfitting industry?
 - Impacts on:
 - Industry as a whole
 - Industry at a regional level
 - Viable businesses at the individual GO level
2. What is our role as government to mitigate these impacts?
 - How do we determine what a viable business operation means ~ what factors should we use to measure the success of individuals?
 - What are GOs currently charging for specific hunts (over the past five years)
 - How many clients are GOs taking out on specific hunts (over the past five years)
 - Demographics of clients (non-rez hunters) – place of residence, age, etc.
 - Are forecasted wildlife populations stable in GO territories? How stable?
 - How accessible is wildlife for hunting? (highway access, remote mountainous areas, etc)
3. To what extent is government responsible for mitigating these impacts?
 - How far should we go in mitigating impacts on individual guide outfitters?
 - How do we decide if GOs viability is being reduced by the policy or by other factors (such as poor business management)?
4. What are the alternatives available to GOs if they need to supplement their income?
 - fishing
 - wildlife viewing and photography
 - conflict of interest?
 - what are the implications of viewing and shooting the same population by the same GO?
 - how does habituation to humans influence an animal's response to hunting?
 - no hunting zone established greater than 500km² surrounding the viewing platforms (Rode, Farley & Robbins, 2006)
 - wildlife viewing occurs from specific sites that are well-regulated
 - human behaviour is consistent at viewing platform sites
 - wildlife are not followed or stalked for viewing advantage
 - general outdoor recreation (hiking, camping, boating, ATVing, lodge)
 - how do we plan for managing the impacts of increased recreation on crown land?

Table 1

Impact of policy on guide outfitting industry per region:

- change in AAH (♠)
- change in harvest rate (♣)
- change in population estimate (♥)
- applied success factor (♦)
- previously didn't have a population estimate (▲)
- previously didn't have an AAH (●)
- 20% transition at the regional level decreased guides (overall) more than 20% (☼?)
- did not follow HQ process for transition period (X)

Region	Species	Impact of Wildlife Allocation Policy					
1	Grizzly	♠	♣				
1	Elk – Bull						
1	Elk – Archery						
2	Elk – Bull	♠?					
3	Grizzly	♠	♣				
3	Moose – Bull						
3	Goat			♥			
3	Bighorn Sheep (3/4 curl)						
4	Grizzly	♠	♣	♥	♦	☼?	X
4	Moose – Bull	♠		♥			
4	Goat	♠		♥			
4	Bighorn Sheep (3/4 curl)	♠		♥		☼	
5	Grizzly	♠	♣				
5	Moose – Bull						
5	Moose – Cow						
6 North	Grizzly	♠	♣			●	X
6 South	Grizzly	♠	♣			●	X
7A	Grizzly	♠	♣				X
7A	Moose – Bull	Something changed – Gos now have a five year allocation of 2940. In the past (if 5 years) they had 2460- GO shares dropped by 1%, but 5 year allocation increased by ~ 20% (new allocation should have been ~1968 – not 2940)					
				♦			X
7A	Moose – Cow			♦			X
7B	Grizzly	♠	♣				
7B	Thinhorn Sheep					▲	
7B	Elk (antlerless)						
7B	Bison						
7B	Goat						
8	Moose – Bull	♠		♥		☼	
8	Goat CLOSED				CLOSED		
8	Bighorn Sheep	♠	♣	♥		☼	

Table 2

Minimum performance requirements for individual GOs to maintain their businesses

Grizzly Bear
Elk
Moose
Bighorn Sheep

Thinhorn Sheep
Mountain Goat
Bison
Caribou

Performance Requirements	Levels of Measurements
Type of Hunt	Grizzly Bear
# of clients	
\$ / hunt	
Net revenue	
Access to client	
Availability of wildlife	
Access to wildlife	

Performance Requirements	Levels of Measurements
Type of Hunt	Thinhorn Sheep
# of clients	
\$ / hunt	
Net revenue	
Access to client	
Availability of wildlife	
Access to wildlife	

Performance Requirements	Levels of Measurements
Type of Hunt	Bighorn Sheep
# of clients	
\$ / hunt	
Net revenue	
Access to client	
Availability of wildlife	
Access to wildlife	

Table 3

Timeline

Timeframe	Product	Person
April 17, 2007	Initial meeting	Kristin, Michele, Alec, Mark & Jen
May 17, 2007	Full Project (10-15p)	Jen

Table 4

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria

Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
Viable Guide Outfitting Industry (Region)	- $\leq 20\%$ increase or decrease in allocation split for transition period
Viable Guide Outfitter Businesses (Individual)	Evaluation criteria to be determined
Wildlife Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Viable habitat area (reported as hectares of old growth forest) - Ecological productivity (reported as percent change in primary or secondary productivity) - Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) - Amount of \$\$ sent to HTC by GO industry
Ecosystem Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing impact assessments of hunting and outdoor recreation - Limits of acceptable change (LAC)
Recreation and Tourism	- Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS)

Table 5

Alternatives

Alternative	Description
Status Quo	Continuation of current conditions – do nothing to offset impact of Wildlife Allocation Policy
Alt. 1	If GOs are impacted by more than 20% (up or down) we will mitigate the impact by <u>providing</u> alternative business opportunities that specifically relate to unique combinations of environmental, social and economic milieus
Alt. 2	If GOs are impacted by more than 20% (up or down) we will mitigate the impact by <u>suggesting</u> alternative business opportunities that specifically relate to unique combinations of environmental, social and economic milieus
Alt. 3	
Alt. 4	

Its

Is the guide industry losing its viability due to the new Wildlife Allocation Policy?

No.

Does government have a role to play in mitigating the impacts of the new Wildlife Allocation Policy on the guide outfitting industry or individual guide outfitters?

Government is not held accountable for the impacts of policies on industries (reference). The Ministry of Environment committed that the guide outfitting industry will remain viable and that the new Wildlife Allocation Policy will not “ruin” the industry.

Case Study 1: No smoking policy in restaurants – Government was not responsible for keeping individual businesses running (reference).

Case Study 2: Fishing restriction policy

Case Study 3: Logging restriction policy

<p style="text-align: center;">Confidential ESTIMATES NOTE (2008)</p> <p>Ministry of Environment Date: February 10, 2009</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ISSUE TITLE: Wildlife Allocation Policy Implementation</p>
--	---

KEY MESSAGES:

- **Implementation of new Allocation Policies and Procedures is under way.**
- **New policies represent a consistent and transparent approach to allocation of wildlife harvest.**

CURRENT STATUS:

Implementation of new Allocation Policies and Procedures is under way:

- Since the approval of the new policies and procedures, all but a few (<3) allocated species in British Columbia have been subjected to the calculated allocation percentages.
- Remaining species will come under new percentages in 2009 and 2010.
- We are currently in a defined 'Implementation Phase' during which time stakeholders are expected to adjust their practices to minimize negative impacts and maximize the benefits of the new procedures before full implementation in 2012.
- Headquarters staff continues to provide advice to regional Biologists on allocations matters.

New policies represent a consistent and transparent approach to allocation of wildlife harvest:

- Both residency groups are keenly aware of allocation decisions and are monitoring implementation closely.

KEY FACTS/BACKGROUND/OTHER AGENCIES:

Implementation of new Allocation Policies and Procedures is under way:

- Allocation of wildlife harvest is conducted for all 'Category A' wildlife, which refers to big game species for which Guide Outfitters are subject to quota.
- Allocation is the process of dividing the harvestable portion of a game population between hunter groups, in this case resident hunters and non-resident hunters (Guide Outfitter clients).
- The Harvest Allocation Review project began in 2004 and was an effort to give surety to both resident and non-resident user groups in their allocation splits and how those splits would be applied.
- A set of 8 policies (3) and procedures (5) received Ministerial approval in March 2007.

New policies represent a consistent and transparent approach to allocation of wildlife harvest

- The new policies and procedures represent, in some cases, a significant departure from previous procedures. Both groups have some degree of concern over how their component of the harvest is going to be impacted.
- The intent of the review project was to develop a fair, transparent and efficient allocation procedure for both residency groups. Despite ongoing challenges in implementation, this objective appears to have largely been met.

s.13

Welsh, Leah ENV:EX

From: Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2012 2:09 PM
To: Foxall, Shannon C FLNR:EX
Subject: FW: Provincial Wildlife Allocation Policy
Attachments: Ltr to Christy Clark re Provincial Wildlife Allocation Policy.pdf
Importance: High

Hi Shannon! Fyi and file only

Thank You! Di Bohja!

Sonia Donison, Manager
Correspondence Services
4th Floor, 780 Blanshard
Tel: 250-356-9638
Fax: 250-356-6791
sonia.donison@gov.bc.ca

From: Thomson.MLA, Steve [<mailto:Steve.Thomson.MLA@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2012 9:50 AM
To: Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX
Subject: FW: Provincial Wildlife Allocation Policy
Importance: High

Cc'd

From: OfficeInfo [<mailto:officeinfo@bcwf.bc.ca>]
Sent: April-20-12 3:41 PM
To: Christy Clark.MLA

Cc: Abbott.MLA, George; Austin.MLA, Robin; Bains.MLA, Harry; Barisoff.MLA, Bill; donna.barnet.mla@leg.bc.ca; Bell.MLA, Pat; Bennett.MLA, Bill; Black.MLA, Dawn; Bloy.MLA, Harry; Bond.MLA, Shirley; Brar.MLA, Jagrup; Cadieux.MLA, Stephanie; Cantelon.MLA, Ron; Chandra Herbert.MLA, Spencer; Chong.MLA, Ida; Chouhan.MLA, Raj; Coell.MLA, Murray; Coleman.MLA, Rich; Conroy.MLA, Katrine; Coons.MLA, Gary; Corrigan.MLA, Kathy; Dalton.MLA, Marc; deJong.MLA, Mike; Dix.MLA, Adrian; Donaldson.MLA, Doug; Elmore.MLA, Mable; Falcon.MLA, Kevin; Farnworth.MLA, Mike; Fleming.MLA, Rob; Foster.MLA, Eric; Fraser.MLA, Scott; Gentner.MLA, Guy; Hammell.MLA, Sue; Hansen.MLA, Colin; Hawes.MLA, Randy; dave.hayer.mla@leg.bc.ca; Heed.MLA, Kash; Hogg.MLA, Gordon; Horgan.MLA, John; Horne.MLA, Douglas; Howard.MLA, Rob; Huntington.MLA, Vicki; James.MLA, Carole; Karagianis.MLA, Maurine; leonard.krong.mla@leg.bc.ca; Krueger.MLA, Kevin; Kwan, Jenny (Office); Lake.MLA, Terry; Lali.MLA, Harry; Lee.MLA, Richard; Lekstrom.MLA, Blair; Les.MLA, John; Letnick.MLA, Norm; MacDiarmid.MLA, Margaret; Macdonald.MLA, Norm; McIntyre.MLA, Joan; McNeil.MLA, Mary; McRae.MLA, Don; Mungall.MLA, Michelle; Pimm.MLA, Pat; Polak.MLA, Mary; Popham.MLA, Lana; Ralston.MLA, Bruce; Reid.MLA, Linda; Routley.MLA, Bill; Routley.MLA, Douglas; Rustad.MLA, John; Sather.MLA, Michael; Simons.MLA, Nicholas; Simpson.MLA, Bob; Simpson.MLA, Shane; Slater.MLA, John; Stewart.MLA, Ben; Stilwell.MLA, Moira; Sultan.MLA, Ralph; Thomson.MLA, Steve; Thorne.MLA, Diane; Thornthwaite.MLA, Jane; claire.trecena.mla@leg.bc.ca; van Dongen.MLA, John; Yamamoto.MLA, Naomi; Yap.MLA, John
Subject: Provincial Wildlife Allocation Policy
Importance: High

Good afternoon Hon. Clark,

Please see the attached letter written by Rodney Wiebe, President of the BC Wildlife Federation

Yours In Conservation,

Aleshia Murrin

Administrative Assistant

BC Wildlife Federation

T 604-882-9988 ext. 221 | E officeinfo@bcwf.bc.ca

101-9706 188th Street

Surrey, BC V4N 3M2

Toll Free: 1-888-881-2293

www.bcwf.bc.ca



Vote today and vote often to save a wetland today! By casting your vote for BCWF Wetlands Education Program's project, you can help BCWF receive \$50K. Visit www.fuellingchange.com now!

[Click Here to Become a BCWF Member Today!](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY WARNING

This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation of or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.



Unit 101 – 9706 188th Street
Surrey, BC V4N 3M2
Telephone: 604-882-9988 Fax: 604-882-9933
Toll Free: 1-888-881 BCWF (2293)
officeinfo@bcwf.bc.ca www.bcwf.bc.ca

Premier Christy Clark
Office of the Premier
PO Box 9041 STN PROV GOVT
Victoria, BC
V8W 9E1

April 16, 2012

Dear Premier Clark,

Re: Provincial Wildlife Allocation Policy

The BC Wildlife Federation would like to provide clarity on behalf of its membership in regards to the implication of the *Provincial Wildlife Allocation Policy*.

The BC Wildlife Federation was extremely disappointed that the provincial government has chosen to alter provisions of the original 2007 *Provincial Wildlife Allocation Policy*. Residents and their families have been negatively impacted by this decision made by your government. Our organization does not support the changes to the policy adopted in 2011. It is unfortunate that government failed to examine the impacts on resident priority and the continuing social and economic impacts to residents of the province.

It was disappointing that following a five year implementation period (2007-2011) that government chose again to slow down implementation of the policy again in 2012 at the request of the commercial guide outfitting industry in BC.

Our membership is currently concerned about the lack of rigour in applying the policy provisions between regions. This is being done in different areas of the province without coordinated transparency or accounting to the very principles and provisions contained within the *Provincial Wildlife Allocation Policy* by the ability of the statutory decision maker to go outside the goal posts established. It is important to the residents that the policy be applied consistently across the province to address our social and harvest needs.

The BC Wildlife Federation is very appreciative that Deputy Minister, Doug Konkin has committed that he would demand application of the policy consistently throughout the province and that if this did not occur then authority would be removed from the Fish and Wildlife Section Heads.

Yours in Conservation

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "R. Wiebe". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Rodney Wiebe, President BC Wildlife Federation

Cc: All Members of the Legislative Assembly
Cc: BC Wildlife Federation Membership