

From: [Fiddler, Rob GCPE:EX](#)
To: [Wong, Gary CSNR:EX](#)
Cc: [Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX](#); [MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX](#)
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 10:27:03 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Ok, thanks Gary

Rob

From: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 10:26 AM
To: Fiddler, Rob GCPE:EX
Cc: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX; MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Great news... please be prepared with updated content on those pages.

Any reference to <http://a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte> should instead be <http://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/>.

But don't publish those pages until we give you the go-ahead. Tentatively, it's next Tuesday at 4pm that will be the cut-over.

Thanks
gary

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 2:01 PM
To: Fiddler, Rob GCPE:EX; Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Cc: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Thanks Rob, appreciated.
Steve

From: Fiddler, Rob GCPE:EX
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 10:35 AM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX; Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Cc: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Hi, yeah that's no problem. I can do that for you.

Rob

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 9:26 AM
To: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Cc: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX; Fiddler, Rob GCPE:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Hi Gary,

NR

Rob Fiddler should be able to update the link on the F&W homepage.

Rob, can you take a look at the email chain below and let us know if you are available to do the change?

Thanks,
Steve

From: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 9:14 AM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Cc: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Steve

NR

➤ Who is the web person responsible for such changes? We need to coordinate the change here with the official 'cut-over' from the old system to the new system. To be honest, I'm uncomfortable with the change being timed **s 22**

We'll probably be cutting over while you're **s 22** . so we need to figure out who to talk to, **s 22** Who's your web person?

Thanks
gary

From: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX

Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2014 11:12 AM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Cc: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Steve

➤ I'm fine with this change, especially seeing as there seems to be limited alternatives

Great.. thanks for understanding.

➤ Do we need to change the link in our fish and wildlife website too (<http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/fw/>)?



Who is the web person responsible for such changes? We need to coordinate the change here with the official 'cut-over' from the old system to the new system. To be honest, I'm uncomfortable with the change being timed

s.22

If AHTE site is not too busy right now (with changes to regs) can we cut over before end of this week? This means

- a) Gary temporarily shuts down the old site
- b) Gary migrates the data from the old site to the new site
- c) F&W web person updates all references to a100.* to the new URL
- d) Steve tests out the new site with the most current data
- e) Steve gives Gary the A-OK
- f) Gary shuts off the old site
- g) Everyone goes home happy!

gary

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2014 7:31 AM
To: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX; Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Hi Gary,

I'm fine with this change, especially seeing as there seems to be limited alternatives. I'm a little unclear on what is being proposed, my assumption is that when people open the previous url they will be given a forwarding link. Do we need to change the link in our fish and wildlife website too (<http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/fw/>)?

Cheers,

Steve

From: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 4:18 PM
To: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Cc: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Well, UX seems a bit challenging, but will leave to Business Area to decide.

Cheers,

Sean Cavanagh

Sr. Business Portfolio Manager | PM for Internet Strategy for the NRS

Client Business Solutions, Information Management Branch, CSNR, FLNRO
250-920-9545

From: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 4:17 PM
To: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Cc: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

➤ I'm not sure what is being presented? Would the user see this?

Yes, exactly.

FYI, Steve will be **s 22** and this is the only remaining issue on moving from boxer.idir.bcgov in Victoria to awesome.bcgov in Kamloops. I'm getting a lot of heat from Adam's group to get this migration going, and shutting down boxer.idir.bcgov.

But I need to hear the input from BPM and Business Area expert...

gary

From: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:00 PM
To: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX; MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Hi Gary,

I'm not sure what is being presented? Would the user see this?

Cheers,
Sean

From: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:55 PM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX; Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte migration to kamloops

Sean and Steve

As you both are aware, we're about to migrate our servers from the Victoria network to Kamloops, and also changing the URL from <http://a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/> to <http://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/>

Originally, I thought we could do a simple 'redirect' that passes the user transparently through to the new site, without any intervention. But CSNR Middle Tier group tells me that this is not possible. Instead they propose the below, which kind of looks like this:



If that's okay with you, Steve, I'll tell them to do it that way. If you say this is 'not acceptable', then we'll go back to them and ask for more options.

thanks
gary

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

From: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2014 12:32 PM
To: Dong, Chunying CSNR:EX; Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX; Tollestrup, Pete CSNR:EX
Cc: Wong, Ken K CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte and pae migration to kamloops

Unfortunately, a100.gov.bc.ca/[pub|int]/ahte is a PRODUCTION site and will require a 301 redirect for several months (at least).

PAE is brand new and so we don't need that.

gary

From: Dong, Chunying CSNR:EX
Sent: August 7, 2014 11:58 AM
To: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX; Wong, Gary CSNR:EX; Tollestrup, Pete CSNR:EX
Cc: Wong, Ken K CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte and pae migration to kamloops

The firewall is open now and the following new URLs work. Please test.

<http://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/>
<http://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/pae/>
<https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>
<https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/pae/>

Next step is the final database refresh/migration.

What to do with the current/old URLs (a100.gov.bc.ca/[pub|int]/[ahtd|pae]) ?

They are managed by SSBC. We'd like to simply drop them after the migration rather than redirect to the new URLs if possible.

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

From: Wong, Ken K CSNR:EX
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 3:25 PM
To: Dewey, Adam N CSNR:EX
Cc: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX; Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte and pae migration to kamloops

onion.dmz and pickle.dmz cannot see awesome.bcgov:80

Please open firewall to let

<http://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/>
<http://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/pae/>
<https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>
<https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/pae/>

to work.

Ken

Oh, I wiped the following so can't test now. Try again monday.

<http://testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/>
<http://testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/pae/>
<https://testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>
<https://testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/pae/>

Ken Wong, Middleware Support,
Information Management Branch, Corporate Services for the Natural Resource Sector B.C. Government, Canada
Phone: 250 387-2939 [Mailto:Ken.K.Wong@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Ken.K.Wong@gov.bc.ca)
The name that can be named is not the true name - Tao Te Ching

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

From: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 2:48 PM
To: Wong, Ken K CSNR:EX; Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX
Subject: RE: ahte and pae migration to kamloops

Hi

> We will need to shutdown the apps for 1/2 day to refresh the data from production on boxer for the final migration.

If this is during business hours, be sure to inform Steve MacIver. He's actively using the production AHTE system to post notices.

thanks
gary

From: Wong, Ken K CSNR:EX
Sent: July 25, 2014 1:50 PM
To: Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX; Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Cc: Dewey, Adam N CSNR:EX; Dong, Chunying CSNR:EX; Tollestrup, Pete CSNR:EX; Brkic, Sasha CSNR:EX
Subject: ahte and pae migration to kamloops

Hi,

DBA copied pae and ahte production data on boxer to the production mysql dbs on reboot.idir.bcgov I create the reverse proxy from testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca to point to the production drupal box awesome.bcgov The URLs are

<http://testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/>

<http://testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/pae/>

<https://testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>

<https://testapps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/pae/>

Please test.

We will need to shutdown the apps for 1/2 day to refresh the data from production on boxer for the final migration.

The current production URL is under a100.gov.bc.ca and is hosted at SSBC reverse proxy server.

<http://a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte>

No URLs for pae in irs.

We will need to submit an iStore to SSBC to point the R/P to awesome instead of boxer. It will take time and coordination.

HOWEVER, we can manage the reverse proxy - NO ISTORE ORDER!!! - if we change the URL to

<http://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/>

<http://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/pub/pae/>

<https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>

<https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/pae/>

which will route thru' our own R/P on onion and pickle.

What do you think?

Thx,
Ken

Ken Wong, Middleware Support,
Information Management Branch, Corporate Services for the Natural Resource Sector B.C. Government, Canada
Phone: 250 387-2939 [Mailto:Ken.K.Wong@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Ken.K.Wong@gov.bc.ca)
The name that can be named is not the true name - Tao Te Ching

-----Original Message-----
From: Wong, Ken K CSNR:EX

Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 1:44 PM
To: Tollestrup, Pete CSNR:EX
Cc: Brkic, Sasha CSNR:EX; Wong, Gary CSNR:EX; Cavanagh, Sean CSNR:EX; Dong, Chunying CSNR:EX
Subject: boxer.bcgov mysql databases migration to kamloops

Hi.

Please migrate the production mysql databases on the windows server boxer.idir.bcgov to a production server in Kamloops.

The databases are:

\$db_url = 'mysql://ahte:xxx@localhost:3306/ahte_prod'

\$db_url = 'mysql://pae:xxx@localhost:3306/pae_prod';

Any more?

The production drupal server is

awesome.bcgov 142.34.161.133

Please let me know the mysql server name and port number so I can test the firewall connection.

Thx,
Ken

Ken Wong, Middleware Support,
Information Management Branch, Corporate Services for the Natural Resource Sector B.C. Government, Canada
Phone: 250 387-2939 [Mailto:Ken.K.Wong@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Ken.K.Wong@gov.bc.ca) The name that can be named is not the true name - Tao Te Ching

From: [MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX](#)
To: [Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX](#)
Subject: RE: AHTE Website
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 9:56:00 AM
Attachments: Comments - Steelhead Framework.docx

The migration wasn't supposed to result in any disruptions, maybe it did but I can't find any evidence that it disrupted or didn't allow comments.

Attached are all of the comments. The reason I state that there is no evidence of disruption is that the first comment is from August 14th and the final comment is on September 12th. Sept 12 was the deadline for comments, which indicates to me that it functioned from Aug 14th to the deadline.....

Which stakeholders have stated that they couldn't post comments? I know we have an email from S.22 but that is the only one I'm aware of....
Steve

From: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 9:37 AM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

Can you compile all the steelhead comments for me?

When did this get migrated and why weren't we made aware – how embarrassing when the stakeholders couldn't post comments.

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 9:13 AM
To: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

Hi Sue,

The website was migrated to a different server in Kamloops, the old link no longer works. Try this one: <https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>.

I haven't had a chance to play with the site since it was migrated but am told it still works like it used to.

Steve

From: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2014 4:42 PM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

Hi Steve – This no longer works for me. I'm trying to compile all the steelhead framework comments. Can you please assist? Thanks.

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2012 2:26 PM

To: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Subject: AHTE Website

There is one comment on the steelhead policy post.

I set up a staff account for you so you can check comments on your own. It is linked through your IDIR, so you should be automatically logged on when you go into the internal version of the site:
<https://a100.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>. May want to add this to your favourites....

Steve

Comments

Provincial Steelhead Management Framework

Posted by **s.22** on August 14th 2014 at 6:39 am.

I believe this draft is much too long winded to be read by many steelheaders. I recommend a more concise document be produced to highlight the important points the Ministry wishes to make. Steelhead are a marvelous sport fish. Hopefully, they will be available to future generations to enjoy. Actions, not words, are required by Government.

Revision (2): Provincial Steelhead Management Framework Provincial Steelhead Plan

Posted by **s.2** on August 16th 2014 at 8:25 pm.

This "plan" is the biggest debacle of anti-use ever ...

Let's be clear, that would be a "NO" to your bullshit plan.

You should all be fired for pushing your elitist agenda of making B.C. catch and release only and with bait bans everywhere. Did I mention you should all be fired ... !!

You are an embarrassment to your "profession". You should be ashamed!

Steelhead are a fish ... they must be managed as such. To pretend they are endangered is criminal.

Good luck with your quest for your BH steelhead panacea!

PSMP

Posted by **s.2** on August 16th 2014 at 8:26 pm.

Opposed!!!!!!

steelhead management framework.

Posted by **s.22** on August 17th 2014 at 9:15 am.

Just lost my lengthy reply.

Here is short version.

I agree with report... good direction.

Vanc island rivers can be too warm to fish . Close when too low or warm.

Classified waters may be needed on vancouver island to preserve fish, quality angling , and create money for enforcement.

Need angler education. Exam. Ethics and fish handling , move to page 1 of regs.

Angling for summer runs needs a low catch per unit effort. Flyfishing or even floating lines is a useful tool.

Private land logging needs riparian zones. A 20 cm tree every 5 meters is insufficient.

Fish need areas of refuge, not jetboats that damage fry and redds. For example, upper Stamp, Dean River.

Terminal selective fisheries are needed by commercial and native groups.

Cheers Rich R

Comments on draft PSMP, proposal #1959

Posted by **s.22** on August 18th 2014 at 1:29 pm.

Not sure if the word attachment went with the document?

s.22 – The comments **s.22** were not posted/attached.

s.22

Provincial Steelhead Plan

Posted by **s.22** on August 24th 2014 at 11:31 am.

Hi

I do not support the plan. Catch and release of all wild fish is not required when populations are abundant like they are in the Skeena and other northern areas. A modest retention (1 per year) can be allowed to

allow a resident to harvest a bleeding fish. I believe if this plan is go ahead (I know it will regardless of public comment) it gives the anti everything crowd ammunition about tormenting wild animals (catch and release).

The plan does not address resident priority and caters to non resident and guiding. It delivers an opinion on the use of hatcheries.

This is the south telling the north what to do about their fishing when they have their own issues and imposing these ideas on the rest of us.

Provincial Steelhead Management Framework

Posted by s.22 on September 9th 2014 at 7:34 pm.

To: FishandWildlife@gov.bc.ca Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 10:46 PM Subject: Provincial Framework for Steelhead Management in BC Greetings, I am writing you as a third generation BC resident angler. I have fished steelhead in BC for over 40 years. I tired to provide you with my personal comments on line, but your web link has not been operational for several days. That is why I am sending you this via email. I have several issues with your Framework for Steelhead Management. For simplicity, they are listed in point form as follows: 1) This document suggests stakeholder transparency is important. With little or no advertising, in my opinion this long-term management framework (policy) was very poorly distributed. You then provided the public with a mere 30 days to respond. And for the past several days your public input web link has not even been functioning. Almost everyone with whom I have talked was completely unaware of your new framework. How much public input and transparency were you actually looking for? 2) Within BC we have a wide range of steelhead abundance. In the South, some stocks are nearly extirpated. While in the North, we have abundant returns on most years. Why would you try and install a provincial-wide management framework when stock abundance is so varied? It seems to me that a Regional Management Strategy would be a better choice. I would also like to add that some systems have spring, summer and winter-run steelhead. Your plan focuses on summer-run steelhead. What are your plans in overlap streams? In terms of stock status, this framework refers to the Keogh River research. It also talks about the 1990s being a period of rapid decline. I would argue that stock abundance in the North has been stable or improving since the 1990s. Why was the north absent from this discussion? A provincial document should have some reference to all stocks within the province. I am not advocating for a harvest renewal. I am simply suggesting that some locations have the benefit of healthy returns, and they could have a more inclusive management strategy. This is especially true with regards to resident access and winter fisheries. 3) This document indicates that enhancement has detrimental effects on wild stocks. Two studies completed on the Kitimat River (pre and post enhancement showed no visible change in genetic composition). The Kitimat is a highly impacted system, that now provides fishers with opportunity. What is wrong with providing a fishery where it would not otherwise exist? I am not

suggesting that healthy wild stocks should be enhanced. I am simply saying that we should keep the option of strategic enhancement on the table - to be used where deemed applicable. 4) I fully support your efforts with regards to catch and release. I practiced catch and release with barbless hooks, long before they became policy. However, I completely disagree with your statements regarding gear types. The available studies indicate that released steelhead (caught on bait and other gear types) have an average release mortality of 2-3%. Your statement that "the use of such highly efficient gear will increase the risk of severe wounding" is your personal opinion. There is no study to date, that I am aware of, that suggests bait has a higher release mortality when compared to other gear types. If a 2.5% release mortality is problematic, then we should consider closure of the fishery. In my opinion, the use of long hinged flies, or flies with trialing hooks called "stingers" are far worse than bait. In fact many anglers (including myself) refuse to use these flies, due to the risk of gill injury. And in some cases, Nymph fishing can be the most effective method there is. Secondly, your provincial plan to ban bait on summer steelhead could severely impact opportunities on systems with winter & spring-run overlaps. And finally, what are your plans with regards to salmon-directed fisheries. We have numerous locations that have active salmon directed fisheries where summer-run fish are present. This bait ban is something that you have continued to put forward every few years. Let it go! 5) "Fly fishing only" regulations should not exist - period! They do not protect fish, they simply provide one self-serving class of angler (mostly guided clients) with sole access. How about considering "resident only non-guided gear fishing". In closing, I find your Draft Steelhead Management Plan to be biased, elitist and at least somewhat based on personal opinion. It truly sounds as if it were written by a guide, or the owner of a fly fishing lodge. I suggest that you consider regional differences, and resident anglers (including all classes of resident anglers) before trying to implement any steelhead management plan. You reference resident angler priority access (under the Allocation of Angling Opportunity Policy). Restricting some gear types, in locations with high abundance, along with mixed steelhead run timing is not conducive to resident priority access. I know many resident anglers along coastal BC that only fish steelhead on hatchery generated fisheries. I hope you consider these points, and recall this ridiculous plan! Regards,

Draft Provincial Steelhead Policy

Posted by **S.22** on September 12th 2014 at 9:24 am.

I am writing you as a second generation BC resident angler who has fished recreationally for steelhead and salmon in northwestern BC for over 40 years. The following, in point form, address several issues with your Framework for Steelhead Management.

1. Stakeholder Involvement: I fail to see how the Province can suggest that transparency in this process is important or even being achieved. The lack of advertising, poor distribution and issues with feedback collection for this long-term management framework (policy) points to an un-democratic agenda to drastically change the recreational fishery in favour of targeted user groups. My experience with this policy,

and with other policy/regulation changes in the Skeena Region which have affected the recreational fishery, is that the limited exposure and response times suggest a calculated effort is being made to keep these issues from the public eye and to keep responses to a minimum. A simple posting on a web-site is insufficient notice when considering a policy change of this magnitude; further, the instructions on where to direct comments was not explicitly provided in the Policy document. I do note that in response to the non-functioning public input web link an extension to the mere 30 days to respond was given; however, there has been a lack of alternative avenues available to the public for exposure and feedback – one unreliable method to submit comments is ridiculous as well as exclusionary to those without computer access/knowledge/capability. I myself was unaware of this issue until being advised by a fellow angler; it seems that the ‘fishing grapevine’ has been the only effective way for concerned anglers to become informed.

2. Given the diversity of steelhead abundance as well as stock types (spring, summer, winter) I question the Province’s intent to try and install a provincial framework geared towards summer run steelhead without specifically addressing areas with low/high abundance or systems with multiple run types. I further note that Keogh River research is specifically referred to; this specific reliance on Keogh research suggests acknowledgement by the Province that it has failed over the long term to conduct adequate research on steelhead throughout the Province and that this Policy is merely a blanket to hide this fact from the general fishing public. Further, the use of research by author(s) with long standing narrow views of steelhead management and the steelhead fishery point to a lack of independence in the development and implementation of this policy. The policy fails to address areas such as the North where stock abundance can be argued to be stable or improving since the 1990s; why is the north is ignored in the discussion? A provincial document needs to refer to stocks in the entire province with areas containing healthy stocks having a more inclusive management strategy; this would maintain non-retention of steelhead, resident access and allow for guided opportunities for non-resident anglers. In the long term this would continue to build steelhead stocks as well as greater public awareness.

3. The Policy fails to address what the Province will do over the long term in order to conduct thorough assessment of steelhead stocks rather than relying on limited and outdated information.

4. The Policy document has a blatant negative perspective with respect to enhancement and wild stocks. The Kitimat River, which is a classic example of how to highly impact a river system, now has a steelhead fishery which draws anglers from around the world; this fishery would not be present without enhancement efforts! Pre and post enhancement studies on the Kitimat River yielded no visible change in genetic composition. Enhancement can provide a fishery where it would not otherwise exist while also allowing for the protection of wild stocks through careful and insightful management. Healthy wild stocks do not need to be enhanced, but keeping the option of strategic enhancement on the table so that it can be used where deemed applicable is necessary.

5. The policy speaks of guidelines for handling of steelhead – there is no reference to a ‘Guide/Guided Code of Conduct & Ethics’; my observations over the past number of years angling in the North is that a considerable portion of the ‘Guide & Guided’ community have become increasingly disrespectful to other user groups. Further, there is a complete lack of information on how this to be accomplished or how it will address non-BC resident anglers. The Province requires that hunters take the CORE course in order to obtain a hunting licence; it is my suggestion that the Province include an angling component within this course as a long term strategy to educate the public given the fact that hunters are usually anglers as well. Alternative avenues of providing angler education could be easily conducted during the BC Family Fishing Weekend.

6. Efforts to maintain catch and release as well as the use of barbless hooks need to be continued, however I cannot support the statements regarding gear types. Available studies indicate that released steelhead (caught on bait & other gear types) have an average release mortality of 2-3%. The statement that "the use of such highly efficient gear will increase the risk of severe wounding" is an opinion. I am not aware of any study that suggests bait has a higher release mortality when compared to other gear types. Should a 2.5% release mortality be that large of an issue then I suggest that considerations need to be made in regard to closure of the fishery. In my opinion, the use of lightweight fly gear (i.e. light rod weight, mainline, and tippet), the use of long hinged flies, or flies with trailing hooks called "stingers" can be considerably worse than bait. Many anglers refuse to use these flies because of the risk of gill injury; this again points to my earlier suggestion that the Province be pro-active and provide avenues for angler education. Secondly, your provincial plan to ban bait on summer steelhead could severely impact opportunities on systems with winter & spring-run overlaps. Finally, the plans with respect to salmon-directed fisheries have been completely unaddressed; numerous locations have active salmon directed fisheries where summer-run fish are present. The raising of a bait ban every few years by the Province (at the behest of the opinions of a highly placed special interest user group?) is something that has to be put aside until a thorough independent and scientific study is conducted across multiple gear types, stocks, systems, conditions and even years can you be conducted.

7. The existence of "Fly fishing only" regulations are extremely troubling. Rather than protecting fish, these regulations simply protect access for a sole gear type and to a significant degree fishing guide operators. In my 40+ years of angling and consulting the fishing regulations I have yet to see a regulation stating "resident only non-guided gear fishing."

In summary, I find the Draft Steelhead Management Plan to be biased (even partially written) by elitist user groups and somewhat based on personal opinion while failing to address the general BC angling community

that pays millions of tax dollars and fees every year. Regional differences and resident anglers (including all classes of anglers) need to be considered and thoroughly consulted before trying to implement any steelhead management plan. The Allocation of Angling Opportunity Policy references resident angler priority access; gear type restrictions in high abundance areas along with mixed steelhead run timing is not conducive to resident priority access.

I hope you consider these points so that the inappropriate and biased plan can be thoroughly revised through improved consultation to address the concerns of the general fishing public.

Respectfully, a very concerned BC resident angler.

From: [Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX](#)
To: [MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX](#)
Subject: RE: AHTE Website
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 10:59:11 AM

We did extend it – originally it was to Sept 5.

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 10:43 AM
To: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

Ok, I assume this is because the link to the website was changed, not because the website itself wasn't working. Still not ideal. Should we extend the deadline again and provide an updated link?

From: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 10:29 AM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

s.22 , and a few others emailed me directly.

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 9:57 AM
To: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

The migration wasn't supposed to result in any disruptions, maybe it did but I can't find any evidence that it disrupted or didn't allow comments.

Attached are all of the comments. The reason I state that there is no evidence of disruption is that the first comment is from August 14th and the final comment is on September 12th. Sept 12 was the deadline for comments, which indicates to me that it functioned from Aug 14th to the deadline.....

Which stakeholders have stated that they couldn't post comments? I know we have an email from s.22 but that is the only one I'm aware of....

Steve

From: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 9:37 AM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

Can you compile all the steelhead comments for me?

When did this get migrated and why weren't we made aware – how embarrassing when the stakeholders couldn't post comments.

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 9:13 AM
To: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

Hi Sue,

The website was migrated to a different server in Kamloops, the old link no longer works. Try this one: <https://apps.nrs.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>.

I haven't had a chance to play with the site since it was migrated but am told it still works like it used to.

Steve

From: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2014 4:42 PM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Subject: RE: AHTE Website

Hi Steve – This no longer works for me. I'm trying to compile all the steelhead framework comments. Can you please assist? Thanks.

From: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2012 2:26 PM
To: Pollard, Sue M FLNR:EX
Subject: AHTE Website

There is one comment on the steelhead policy post.

I set up a staff account for you so you can check comments on your own. It is linked through your IDIR, so you should be automatically logged on when you go into the internal version of the site: <https://a100.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>. May want to add this to your favourites....

Steve

From: [MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX](#)
To: [Wong, Gary CSNR:EX](#); [Beveridge, Megan ENV:EX](#)
Cc: [Jousi, Mark CSNR:EX](#); [Smith, Kelly B FLNR:EX](#)
Subject: RE: Notice of changes to DELIVERY/TEST of AHTE and PAE
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2014 9:02:00 AM

Hi Gary,

Sounds good, I'll stand by for the date. Note I'm out of the office for much of August and September. However, Kelly Smith should be able to test the application in my absence.

Cheers,

Steve

From: Wong, Gary CSNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2014 5:10 PM
To: MacIver, Stephen FLNR:EX; Beveridge, Megan ENV:EX
Cc: Jousi, Mark CSNR:EX
Subject: Notice of changes to DELIVERY/TEST of AHTE and PAE

Hi Steve and Megan

How are you? CSNR Middle Tier Infrastructure is in the midst of a large project, moving all our applications to the new servers in Kamloops and Calgary. They're now planning for the AHTE and PAE applications.

For Steve, that is:

<https://delivery.a100.gov.bc.ca/int/ahte/>
<https://delivery.a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/ahte/>

For Megan, that is:

<https://delivery.a100.gov.bc.ca/int/pae/>
<https://delivery.a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/pae/>

Once I get a date for when you can test, I'll let you know. Please set aside 15-30 minutes to do some testing of your applications, on the new servers (e.g. the two URL's above, next to your name).

Thanks
gary

Sep 12,
2014 -
9:24 am

Sep 9, 20

01 00

Aug 24, 1964

20

Aug 17, 1994

20 22

Aug 16, 2014

20 00

Aug 14, 2014

20