

CROWN OF THE CONTINENT MANAGERS PARTNERSHIP 2007 FORUM SUMMARY

THEME: ECOLOGICAL HEALTH

7-9 MARCH 2007

CRANBROOK, BRITISH COLUMBIA

CONTENTS

SECTION A: FORUM DETAILS	3
Welcome and introductions	3
Agency updates.....	4
Crown of the Continent Geotourism Map Project	16
Steering Committee Report to Forum.....	18
Panel Discussion – Ecological Health in the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem.....	21
Breakout Groups – Ecological Health in the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem.....	28
Summary- Day 1	30
CMP – Strategic Communications.....	31
Refining Direction for the CMP	37
 APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANT LIST	 38
 APPENDIX B: AGENDA	 41

MIISTAKIS INSTITUTE
FOR THE ROCKIES



Forum Summary prepared by the Miistakis Institute

SECTION A FORUM DETAILS

Thursday, March 8, 2007

Welcome and introductions

Kathryne Tenesses

Treaty negotiator, Ktunaxa

- Kathryne acknowledged organizers and welcomed delegates to Ktunaxa territory. She wished the participants a fruitful meeting.
- Congratulations on the uniqueness of the group and the Crown Managers Partnership's interest in taking care of things in an apolitical way. Managers that have concerns and mutual interests in the ecosystems of this area.
- Impressive also is that they have been involved since 2001.
- Ktuna continues to support the efforts of the group and expects to be a full participant - the work and topic today is extremely important for our nation.
- She wished participants well in their deliberation and looks forward to the outcome of those deliberations.
- As the Crown Managers Partnership implements its strategic plan the Ktunaza look forward to becoming full supportive participant.

Jim Abbott

Member of Parliament, Kootenay Columbia, British Columbia

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage

- Will speak bluntly and express where the people of his districts are.
- Dealing with very good people in his constituency that are not necessarily on the same page as the Crown Managers Partnership.
- First thing the CMP should do is speak to people in the area. Harvey Locke and John Bergenske are not representative of the head space of where people are in this region.
- Need to create a buy in into the CMP mission. There is a probability of the mission failing as long as the ordinary person doesn't understand where the CMP is coming

from and what it is doing. Any politician that moves too far ahead of where constituents are, is doomed to fail.

- Appreciate American representatives being here and the respect that's been built on mutual interests - continue to improve who the CMP is and where it is.

Ross Priest

Mayor of the City of Cranbrook

- Welcome to those from Alberta and Montana
- 2001 was the CMP's first gathering. The CMP is in Cranbrook again for a 5 year review of its mission. Mayor Priest expressed a keen interest in the review, in particular given the outdoor nature of Cranbrook.
- Understands but differs somewhat with Jim Abbott's view on the community.
- Understands CMP's mission and congratulates the CMP on working together given the jurisdictional fragmentation. Trying to work through differences with collaborative processes.
- Cranbrook works positively with the Ktunaxa nation and thanked Kathryn Tenesses for having them on their traditional lands.
- Cranbrook's economy has included logging, mining. Cranbrook is diversifying it's economy to consider protection of natural resources. This later aspect is not less important but rather important to ensure it along with a diverse economy.
- The City of Cranbrook's international airport is in the midst of a significant expansion. The airport will facilitate the world to discover and recreate in and around Cranbrook.
- Sensitive to ecological systems for those purposes.

Agency Updates

- Bill Dolan – Parks Canada
 - √ *Contribution Agreement – CMP*
 - Parks Canada (WLNP) has recently signed a 5 year Contribution Agreement with the Miistakis Institute for the Rockies
 - The Agreement is in place to support the activities and priorities of the Crown Managers Partnership and the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park
 - The maximum value of the Contribution Agreement is \$200,000 and is dependent on contributions from other agencies, foundations, etc.

- The Agreement is focused on the actions and workplan arising from the CMP Strategic Plan; status of which will be defined later in the Forum

√ *New Resources – Ecological Integrity Capacity*

- Recent federal budget provided new resources to support ecological integrity and asset re-capitalization.
- Last year, Parks were asked to submit proposals that would clearly advance the maintenance or restoration of ecological integrity
- Waterton Lakes National Park submitted a few proposals and received new resources in three program areas. More specifically:
 - An Interpretation and Outreach officer
 - An Ecosystem Scientist (Bison and Aquatics restoration)
 - Additional resources to manage invasive, non-native vegetation, to restore disturbed sites and put in place an effectiveness monitoring program

√ *International Peace Park Conference*

- The Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park is celebrating it's 75th anniversary in 2007.
- In celebration of that milestone the IPP is work with partners to host a international conference to showcase trans-boundary management
- Other partners include the Miistakis Institute, Universities of Calgary, Lethbridge and Montana as well as Rotarians from Alberta and Montana [Other SC members at Forum – Brace Hayden , Len Broberg, Maddy Pinto]
- Call for papers is out [website: <http://www.peaceparks2007.org>] and there is a clear focus in the Program for regional trans-boundary co-operation which is very relevant to the Crown Managers Partnership

√ *Park Management Plan (PMP) & State of Parks Report*

- The National Parks Act requires that we review/update the Park Management Plan every 5 years. The process will start in fall of 2007.
- In advance of the PMP review, a State of the Parks report is in preparation and it will integrate monitoring around ecological integrity, public education and visitor experience.

√ *Prescribed Fire Program*

- Waterton Lakes National Park implemented its largest prescribed burn in April, 2006 on the Eskerine Complex, between the bison paddock and the Red Rock Parkway.

- Another large prescribed burn is planned for the area south of the Waterton River this spring, subject to right weather conditions.

- Cliff Thesen – Alberta Parks

- √ *Organizational Restructuring*

- In November of 2006 there was leadership race to replace the former Premier of Alberta Ralph Klein. As a result, the new Premier became Ed Stelmach. Subsequently, the new premier re-shuffled his cabinet and created a new department titled Tourism, Parks, Recreation and Culture. Within this newly created department, four divisions were created, one of which is the Parks, Conservation, Recreation and Sport Division which is responsible for the Alberta Parks Service. While the names have changed, the four program goals of the Alberta Parks Service have not. So, for the most part, it will be business as usual. That being said, on Friday march 2nd, John Kristensen, Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for the Division of Parks, Conservation, Recreation and Sport announced that he will be retiring in July of 2007 with his last working day to be April 30th. It is hoped that the recruitment and selection of John's replacement will not cause too much disruption.

- √ *75th Anniversary of the Alberta Parks System*

- 2007 marks the 75th anniversary of the provincial parks system in Alberta. The parks system was initiated in 1932 with the establishment of Park Lake and Aspen Beach Provincial Parks. The Alberta Provincial Parks system now includes over 500 sites and a landbase of over 6.8 million acres. There will be a variety of special events and promotional give- aways throughout the system this year. Of note is the commissioning of four Robert Bateman wildlife painting that will be reproduce in a limited number of prints for re-sale.

- √ *2006 Year In Review*

- 2006 was very challenging for the staff of SW Area of Alberta Parks. The floods of 2005 caused over 9 million dollars in damages across the Area. Approximately 8 million of this was at Fish Creek Provincial Park located within the City of Calgary. This park receives over 3 million users a year so the loss of 7 pedestrian bridges and 40 % of the pathway system was significant and resulted in a lot of public oversight and comment. Currently, construction crews are working at the replacement or rebuilding of a number of pedestrian bridges at Fish Creek at a cost of 4.5 million dollars. The replacement bridge design uses a stress cable suspension design uncommon in North America although in use in Europe. We also are just finishing the rebuilding and/or reclamation of Willow Creek Provincial Park. It has been a long grind but did allow some opportunity to

realign trail system and upgrade some facilities. It also was a learning experience for staff and gave the opportunity to experiment with and use bio-engineering techniques.

We have had a sizeable increase capital construction budgets over the couple of years which has allowed us to construct a number of new facilities and upgraded existing facilities at a variety of sites with our area. As well as part of the Water for Life Strategy, we continue to work on the upgrading or replacement of a number of water treatment facilities and distribution systems as well as the decommissioning of a number of wells previously equipped with hand pumps.

In 2006, the Harvie family, who ranch between Cochrane and Calgary, approached the province with a proposal to sell approx. 3200 acres of land to the province for the creation of new provincial park to be named Glenbow Provincial Park. The lands, because of their proximity to Calgary, have high values due to their development potential. The Harvie family accepted a price of 40 million which was significantly below the appraised value of 67 million. In addition, the family then used 6 million of the purchase price to create two parks foundations to support for the future operation of two provincial parks – Glenbow and Lois Hole Provincial Parks. Glenbow Provincial Park will provide protection of a sizeable acreage of riparian and native grassland along the Bow River between Cochrane and Calgary. It will eventually provide for a pathway connection between Cochrane and the City of Calgary approx. 10 mile of riparian area along the Bow River. Along with the city pathway system it will allow for a connecting river valley pathway from Cochrane right through the City to Fish Creek Provincial Park on the south end of the city

In term of resource management work, Area staff have been working toward establishing a strong invasive species monitoring and control program. We were able to get about \$30,000. in federal grant money to help out. As will staff have been working on completing gaps in bio-physical inventory work at West Castle Wetlands Ecological Reserve. Staff have also been very busy dealing with industrial referral on adjacent lands to our protected areas – in particular the development of wind energy in the Pincher Creek area. As this is a new land use to southern Alberta, it has been very challenging and a learning experience.

√ ***The Year Ahead***

Looking ahead, it is anticipated that the coming year will be just as busy as the past two. Our capital construction and upgrading program will taking on about 2.5 million dollars worth of projects across the Area including, paving of pathways and parking lots at Fish Creek, upgrading the Oldman Dam PRA, and upgrading the water treatment and distribution systems at a number of sites. In

addition, staff will initiate and complete assessment and design work on a number of key facilities such as Sikome Lake, Fish Creek Environmental Learning Centre, Park Lake campground upgrading, and the Little Bow water distribution system. This year, due to a number of internal and external construction projects, the Sikome Lake swim facility at Fish Creek will not be operated.

In terms of resource management and research initiatives, staff will be carrying on with a number of projects. We will be establishing a strong invasive species monitoring and control program across a large portion of the SW Area. We will also continue to support inter-agency research projects both inside and adjacent to our protected areas. Through referral processes, we will continue to work with industry and as well municipal and other provincial agencies to minimize the impacts of adjacent land use practices on our sites and users. This is particularly demanding in the case of wind energy projects in the Pincher Creek area adjacent to the Oldman Dam PRA.

√ ***Issues and Challenges Facing the Alberta Parks Organization***

Over the coming years, the parks organization will be faced with a number of challenges. The **first of these challenges** will be increased recreational pressures on our sites and facilities based on growing population and competing interests for recreational opportunities. It is projected that the population of southern Alberta will double in 20-25 years. In addition to this high population growth, there are currently about 60,000 OHVs sold each year in Alberta. The level of motorized recreational demand is increasing at a staggering rate. However, the opportunity to use these recreational vehicles is limited by a finite landbase. The increased pressure on public lands, particularly within the Forest Reserve, for a variety of recreational activities such as OHV use and random camping is also translating into increased pressure on the Parks system. The division is already experiencing pressure for more access and provision of OHV staging areas within protected areas. Along with the increase pressures placed on the landbase by recreational uses, there are existing commitments for traditional resource development and extraction, along with new resource development pressures such as wind energy, coalbed methane, magnetite mining, other minerals such as uranium. This will lead to **the second pressure** that we will face as a parks organization which is incompatible uses on lands adjacent to protected areas. As I mentioned earlier, we are currently experiencing remarkable growth in wind energy in the Pincher Creek area on lands adjacent to the ODPRA and as well residential development adjacent to Fish Creek and to sites such as Wyndham Carseland and Little Bow Provincial Parks. This combination of population growth and increasing development pressures has lead to the

recognition that the province needs to develop a land use framework. It is anticipated that this land use framework will be completed by the end of June 07 and will set the stage for integrated land use management planning, likely at a regional level.

The third challenge that we face as an organization, and one that is more immediate, is the issue succession planning. As we move through the next five years we will be faced with the loss of an unusually high number of vacancies of key staffing positions. This will result in a loss of organizational continuity, experience and history, and will make the transfer of information and knowledge difficult.

- Brace Hayden – Glacier National Park

- √ *Going-to-the-Sun Road Storm Damage*

- On Nov 7 and 8, 2006, heavy rains fell on the park. Nine inches fell during this period at the Flat Top Mountain precipitation gauge. Extensive washouts occurred on the Going-to-the-Sun Road at both lower and higher elevations. Emergency monies were made available and repair efforts began in the late fall. Repairs of the road are anticipated to be completed in time for a road reopening over Logan Pass in June 2007. Repairs include the placement of a Bailey bridge across one of the larger washouts on the road's east side. The November rainstorm also caused damage to numerous park bridges and to the park's trail system, and an assessment of these repair needs is underway.

- √ *Going-to-the-Sun Road Reconstruction*

- Major road reconstruction has commenced and an estimated \$140 - \$170 million in reconstruction monies are anticipated to be spent over 8 years. During the 2007 season, emphasis will be on completing emergency repairs first so that the road can remain open to visitors. During the 8 year reconstruction period, visitors can expect delays of up to 30 minutes (cumulative) during the peak season (June-Sept).

- √ *Transit Center and Shuttles*

- A transit center will be opened in the Apgar area in July 2007. The purpose is to provide visitor orientation to the park and offer a place for people to park their vehicles so they can utilize the park's newly implemented shuttle system.

- √ *Avalanche Hazard Reduction Evaluation along Highway 2*

- The Burlington-Northern Santa Fe railroad's tracks skirt the southern border of Glacier National Park. The railroad has requested that it be allowed to use explosives in the park to trigger avalanches in areas where such snow

accumulations threaten the railroad. In 2005, the park in association with the Flathead National Forest and the Montana Department of Transportation, commenced preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) regarding the BNSF request. In late 2006 the park released a draft EIS in which it indicated that its preferred alternative was to disallow blasting in the park and instead encourage BNSF to construct new snow sheds in some areas and to lengthen existing snow sheds in other areas. The park conducted a series of public hearings on the proposal and over 4,000 letters of comment were received. Public sentiment is strongly in favor of disallowing blasting.

√ *Lodgepole Project in British Columbia*

Cline Mining Corporation is proposing a 2 million ton per year open pit coal mine in the headwaters of the North Fork of the Flathead River in British Columbia (a.k.a. the Lodgepole Project). The North Fork of the Flathead River flows across the international border and forms the western border of Glacier National Park. There are strong concerns regarding the impacts of the proposed mine to the Flathead drainage, the park, and to Flathead Lake. Park Service staff are involved in the development of the "Terms of Reference" for the mining plan that Cline will submit to the British Columbia Environmental Assessment office. The United States is also strongly encouraging that the Federal Canadian Environmental Assessment Act be invoked which would expand the evaluation to include decision making by the Canadian Federal government in such areas as transboundary impacts and fisheries.

√ *Snowmobile access lawsuit.*

For the past 7 years, the park has been embroiled in a lawsuit involving a park landowner desiring to access his private property in the park by snowmobile. The lawsuit has bounced between the Federal District Court and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Most recently, the Federal government won at the District Court level however, this decision was again immediately appealed. The plaintiff is alleging that he has pre-park easement rights that give him the ability to drive behind closed gates anytime he so chooses. The use of snowmobiles has been prohibited in Glacier National Park since 1976.

√ *Budget woes*

Congress has still not acted on a budget for the National Park Service for the fiscal year that began October 1, 2006. Instead, the NPS is authorized to spend money under a "continuing resolution" which means at the same level as the previous fiscal year. This situation has had the effect of curtailing some aspects of

park operations and planning (i.e. hiring dates for seasonal employees, travel, etc).

√ *Ecological monitoring*

Glacier staff is involved in the development of a major ecological monitoring program for the park. This involves the choosing of selected ecological parameters and the establishment of a long-term program to monitor the status of such.

√ *Seventy Fifth Anniversary Celebration*

This year marks the 75th anniversary of the designation of the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park by the US Congress and the Canadian Parliament in 1932. Waterton and Glacier National Parks are both involved in planning a “Peace Park Conference” to celebrate this important designation. Participants will include managers of international peace parks and other transboundary protected areas; academics with expertise in peace park management; managers of areas adjacent to Waterton and Glacier including Native Americans and Rotary Club members. A website for the conference has been established at: www.peaceparks2007.org

▪ Jamie Belt – Invasive Plants Working Group

The Invasive Species Network is developing a field guide on invasive species for educational purposes for the whole of the Crown of the Continent. The Network received many more species submissions than they had anticipated. Network members submitted 95 species which they deemed to be of primary importance to their region. The guide will not be able to profile 95 species so the network is currently working on narrowing down the list.

were received from the network species in the guide which they deemed to be of primary importance to the region.

▪ Rich Moy – Flathead Basin Commission and State of Montana

i. Flathead Basin Commission

The Flathead Basin Commission hired a full-time Executive Director, Caryn Miske, and she will replace Mark Holston on the Crown Manager’s Steering Committee. Caryn graduated with an MA from Columbia University and has been a practicing attorney in Missoula for a number of years. She is also toward a PhD in Forestry.

The Commission also developed a new strategic plan for the next five years that refocuses the Commission. Over the past ten years the Commission has been focused on its Voluntary Nutrient Reduction Strategy to mitigate non-

point sources of pollution and to restore riparian habitats in the Basin. During that time, the Commission raised many millions of dollars toward this effort. However, the Commission felt it was still losing the battle of uncontrolled growth so the Commission's new focus is on education and outreach in order to do a better job of managing and affecting land use decisions.

I think there is a lot of commonality from what I heard from the Mayor of Cranbrook with the Mayors of Fernie, Whitefish and Kalispell. They all feel the future of their communities rests with diversifying their economies and moving more toward recreation, tourism, and other areas rather than solely on resource extraction.

ii. Milk/St. Mary Issues

We are waiting to hear from the IJC on its decision regarding the IJC St. Mary and Milk Rivers Administrative Measures Task Force Directive of December 20, 2004. The Task Force submitted its draft report in the spring of 2006 and hearings were held in May 2006. The issue will not be over until Montana is able to obtain its entitlement as defined in the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty.

The Montana Reserved Water Rights Compact Commission is negotiating the reserved water rights on the Blackfeet Reservation. The tribal reserved water right dates back to its treaty rights which occurred before 1880. To satisfy the anticipated 50,000 af/yr reserved water rights, the Tribes and Commission are considering enlarging Sherburne Reservoir and raising Lower St. Mary's Lake.

The State of Montana continues to pursue the enlargement and rehabilitation of the St. Mary Canal and diversion works. Authorization and funding is presently being sought from the United States Congress.

iii. British Columbia Issues

Governor Martz and Premier Campbell signed an Environmental Cooperation Agreement in the fall of 2003 that "preserves, conserves and enhances our share environment for the benefit of existing and future generations". Presently, the State and Province are in discussion to develop Action Plans to implement this document. Negotiations have slowed; however, I hope we can renew them again. Montana desires to have assurances on the protection of Glacier National Park and the draft document in its present form does not provide those assurances and in fact, it weakens the original document signed by Martz and Campbell. We still hope to negotiate a "win-win" agreement that does not include mining in the B.C. Flathead.

iv. Lodgepole Mine Assessment

We again thank B.C. for allowing Montana to participate in its Environmental Assessment process of the Lodgepole mine. Montana has a 13 member state/federal team involved with the assessment. It is a bit disturbing that we have submitted three sets of comments on the draft TOR, and so far, practically none of our comments have been included into the TOR. The FBC held three hearing on the TOR, two in Kalispell and one in Missoula. In Kalispell, Governor Schweitzer and Senator Baucus opposed the mine as it would have significant impacts on Glacier National Park. We have asked the Governor to petition the implementation of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act as this may be the only way that to address comprehensively the cumulative and tranboundary impacts associated with the proposed project.

v. Other Comments

A federal law passed Congress and signed by Bush last fall that bands the exploration and development of oil and gas on federal lands along the Rocky Mountain Front of Montana.

Plum Creek Timber Company is the largest private land owner in Northwest Montana and is presently cutting large tracts and then subdividing and selling them. Plum Creek feels it can grow trees faster in the southeast U.S. than in Montana. There is significant concern by a number of state and federal agencies, land trusts and communities on the impacts these sales will have on wildlife and other ecological factors. Presently, Plum Creek is working with these entities to find the ways to mitigate impacts and in a number of instances are transferring ownership of these lands to state and federal agencies with adjoining lands and the to land trusts.

- Len Broberg – Transboundary Planning, Policy and Management Initiative
The University of Calgary Faculty of Environmental Design through Dr. Michael Quinn and the University of Montana Environmental Studies Program through Dr. Len Broberg continue to operate the Transboundary Planning, Policy and Management Initiative and have funding in place through 2009. The Initiative is working to develop the program for the Waterton Glacier International Peace Park Conference in September 2007, offering the field course to graduate students at both universities and promoting/funding research on issues relevant to natural resource management in the Crown of the Continent region. Currently we have students working on wildlife crossings of Canada Hwy 3 in Alberta and are actively looking for other suitable research projects/topics for students. Contact either Michael Quinn

at quinn@ucalgary.ca or Len Broberg at len.broberg@umontana.edu if you have questions, ideas or projects.

▪ Neil Stewart- Municipal District of Pincher Creek

As is the case in many parts of Alberta with our booming economy, there is increasing development pressure within the M. D. Some examples of this are as follows:

i. Castle Mountain Resort

Previously 88 housing units, approvals given to increase to 225. We are striving to protect 38.5 acres of land the M.D. owns east of the West Castle River, opposite the ski resort, as a wildlife corridor and have been in touch with Alberta Sustainable Resources about options

ii. Stanfield Mining / EVEX Metals Concentration Plant

Stanfield have a mine in B.C. on the Bull River east of Cranbrook, and wish to transport the ore extracted to Pincher Creek for processing to extract copper, gold etc. there, subsequently returning the tailings to the mine site

iii. Oil & gas exploration & drilling, with related pipeline construction continues to be active due to high energy prices.

Coal bed methane may be on our horizon as at least company has listed this resource as a potential drilling target in our area

iv. Windmills are becoming more prevalent on the landscape with about 180 currently in place and development applications approved and pending to increase this number to approximately 500

v. Residential subdivision, especially in the Burmis Lundbreck corridor at the mouth of the Crowsnest Pass, has the potential to further inhibit wildlife movement through this area

vi. Agricultural lands in our M.D. generally receive a high level of protection from residential subdivision under our Land Use Bylaw, and this is being assisted adjacent to Waterton Lakes National Park due to actions of the Nature Conservancy of Canada.

vii. Mineral extraction (strip mining) for gravel continues to be a common land use within our area, and a magnetite mine has been proposed on the foot of the Livingstone Range in an area used by Bighorn Sheep as a lambing ground

In short, we continue to be under the standard pressures for development seen elsewhere in Alberta, generally described as “Every thing, Every where, Every Time”. In order to be better able to respond to this development pressure, the M.D. participated with several other funding agencies in the “Southern Foothills Cumulative Effects Study” conducted by Dr. Brad Stelfox. This study looked at an area from Pincher Creek to the North end of the Porcupine Hills, west to the B.C. border, and east to Highway 2. It captured data on 100 years of development history, and generated a 50 year forecast of the future based on a “Business as usual” case for each major land use found in the region. Included were:

Livestock grazing	Wind Energy
Farming of Cultivated Lands	Off Road Motor Vehicle Use
Intensive Livestock (feedlots)	Residential Development
Forestry	Water Well Drilling
Oil & Gas	Etc.

The next step is to work up a scenario of the future based on current “Industry Best Practices” to see if this would be “more acceptable” to the community. In conjunction with this study, we need to conduct consultation sessions to define specific landscape based values that the community believes should be protected to achieve a more desirable future. It is intended that this exercise will better inform us for use in our land use planning and inform the Province of Alberta in their current undertaking relative to development of a Land Use Framework which will recognize limits to cumulative effects thresholds.

viii. **Other** - Our Agricultural Service Board continues to be active in:

- Control of invasive plants
- Mitigation of soil erosion issues
- Watershed Protection

▪ Wayne Stetski – BC Ministry of Environment

2007/08 Fiscal Year Throne Speech included government's commitment to a leading edge Climate Change Strategy including new standards of 0 emissions for any new proposed coal fired thermal electricity generating plants.

BC's portion of the Crown continues to have healthy ecosystems and fish and wildlife populations. Mountain pine beetle is a significant issue in BC generally including the East Kootenay.

The Cline Mine proposal is in the Environmental Assessment stage. They have received hundreds of submissions from the public.

There are no new commercial backcountry recreation tenures except for possible trail rides and ski tours in the area operated by a Guide Outfitter in the Akamina Kishinena Park area. No new coalbed methane proposals. There are new wind energy (windmill) proposals for the Kootenays but none currently for the area in the Crown. There are significant expansion plans for the existing coal mines in the Elk Valley into the future.

The tourism industry is enthusiastic about the BC portion of the proposed National Geographic Geotourism Map and Guide.

The Southern Rocky Mountains Management Plan (SRMMP) Implementation Committee continues to be active and involved. Recently two new Access Management Areas under the Wildlife Act (Ministry of Environment legislation and primarily non-motorized areas except for commercial uses) have been proposed for the Flathead River Valley. One, called the Upper Flathead, would require the Integrated Land Management Bureau of the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, to amend the SRMMP to change a zoning designation from motorized to non-motorized. This may require additional public consultation.

Sue Crowley also introduced the Memory Project. With the loss of experienced staff expected due to retirement the ministry is looking at the issues this will create and at implementing a project to facilitating the transfer of information and knowledge. A number of BC partner agencies that includes government and agriculture have been coordinating an Invasive Plant Project. This is the 3rd year and an evaluation will now be conducted that should provide feedback in the next year.

Mike Gall informed the forum that grizzly bear DNA data from the Elk valley is being processed as well as the mountain goat inventory. The regional office is looking at increased enforcement of the ATV monitoring.

Crown of the Continent Geotourism Map Project

Steve Thompson – National Parks Conservation Association

- National Geographic, National Parks Conservation Association and the Chinook Institute are working together on a Crown of the Continent Geotourism Map project.
- The definition of geotourism being applied is tourism that sustains or enhances the geographical character of a place – its environment, heritage, aesthetics, culture, and the well-being of its residents.
- What could be done to sustain and enhance the character of these places for travelers and the people living there? How to keep the “Sense of Place” – the geographic character of the place
- Is there a market for protecting places – what are people looking for. There is a huge market. Places that maintain their sense of place have historical and cultural assets well worth keeping.

- Surveys have shown that travelers wish to be part of the solution rather than the problem in having these places maintain their character.
 - √ Montana Tourism – Feedback from the public in developing their strategic plan has been that Montanans don't want tourism that destroys their land – that competes with their local needs. Montana Tourism should work on things that complement their needs.
 - √ NPCA conducted similar research looking at attitude and values of tourists. Residents all share similar concerns: water, environment. All concerned that development is happening in a way that is destructive to these values.
- The Chinook Institute is a partner in Alberta and BC working on community stewardship.
- A National Geographic pilot project looked at 94 World Heritage sites. When looking at stewardship rating looking at the regional scale (broader area). Waterton and surrounding regions rated high (73 – best scores are from 78 to 87). Issues identified were real estate development and wildlife encroachment on habitat.
- The Crown of the Continent (CoC) boundaries is generally defining an ecosystem but the NPCA is also interested in the cultural boundaries that define the CoC which becomes slightly blurred.
- Like Rotary International this project hopes to help look at this region beyond barriers to help maintain the character before it's too late. There are concerns that changes are not happening in the right direction.
- Principles of the Map project are:
 - √ Market for stewardship so need to find out what need to steward
 - √ Emphasis on community involvement
 - √ Protect the product; protect the place.
 - √ Whole is greater than the sum of the parts.
- A similar map project was done in Vermont and a second has just completed for the Arizona Sonora.
- The Sonora Desert Partnership had many partners and included 27 community forums. The map highlights events, places etc. It takes major themes (ie: seasons in Vermont since that's what locals live their life by; Sonora is diff); based on what's important to locals in the region
- In each project there is a sub-regional partnership. An Advisory Committee works with National Geographic although National Geographic will have the final say on the map content.
- What is role of Land Management Agencies? To assist in identifying what should be included on the map. As nomination come in the agencies take the lead on stewardship – ie: Should this trail be on the map? Is there carrying capacity to place a location on the map if it is lush bear habitat?
- Only 100 nominations will likely make it on the map. Authentic and sustainable is subjectively defined. The Advisory Committee will look at what is the local attitude

towards it, does it support local community, does it support agriculture other local businesses, and what defines the location and heritage. Heritage is a big part.

- To sustain and enhance the character and integrity of our place. To celebrate a sense of place to ultimately preserve the character of a place.
- The project website is www.crownofthecontinent.net. Nominations are being accepted. The deadline is May 11, 2007.
- There has been the thought to incorporate activities such as helping with Blackfeet or other stewardship projects etc. Not just on visiting but stewardship examples but here has to be the capacity to support this.

Questions:

- How much has this boosted the local visitation? What's the distribution plan? In Vermont the local partnerships oversaw the distribution. The locals felt strongly enough to take it over. Sonora is now planning their distribution. The map just came out in January so now working with Mike Quinn and a student to measure its effectiveness.
- The Crown of the Continent map is expected out in March 2008.

Steering Committee Report to Forum

Wayne Stetski – BC Ministry of Environment

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Wayne Stetski extended an invitation to anyone interested in becoming part of the committee. Enthusiastic additions are welcome and those interested are encouraged to contact current Steering Committee members.

Current Steering Committee:

- Bill Dolan - Waterton Lakes National Park
- Brace Hayden - Glacier National Park
- Danah Duke - Miistakis Institute for Rockies
- Elliot Fox – Blood Tribe
- Ian Dyson - Alberta Environment
- Jimmy DeHerrera - Flathead National Forest
- Larry Price – BC Integrated Land Management Bureau
- Len Broberg - University of Montana
- Marc Holston - Flathead Basin Commission
- Mike Quinn - University of Calgary
- Rich Moy – Montana Dept of Natural Resources and Conservation
- Roy Doore - Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Wayne Stetski - BC Ministry of Environment

Strategic Plan Review

- The Vision of the CMP is to have “an ecologically healthy Crown of the Continent Ecosystem (COCE)”
- The CMP works together to achieve this by building relationships and collaborations as well as knowledge on COCE’s ecological health and aligning their agency mandates with this vision.

Activity since 2006 Forum

- Improve Understanding
 - √ Researching how ‘ecological health’ is currently defined in the COCE.
 - √ Reviewed and compile indicator-based approaches currently used in COCE to measure ecosystem health.
- Raise Awareness
 - √ Maintaining CMP web site
 - √ Developed a strategic plan presentation to generate internal agency support
- Promote Collaboration
 - √ Host 2007 Crown Managers Forum
 - √ Develop metadata framework for coordinating data across the COCE
- Develop Organizational Strength
 - √ Develop logo and letterhead
 - √ Work with Lincoln Institute to improve the CMP’s organizational effectiveness

CMP Future Workplan

- Convene agency workshop to identify approaches to measure ecological health
- Compile comprehensive “State of the Crown” report
- Upgrade Website to include information on management approaches, research initiatives and findings etc.
- Continue to build Metadata framework
- Draft and implement strategy for attracting and retaining agency partners and Steering Committee members
- Refine fund development strategy

Guy Greenaway – Miistakis Institute

Miistakis Intitute continues to act as the Secretariat for the CMP providing Strategic and Project Management. Two presentations will be given on work performed for the CMP.

- i. Ecological Health – led by Tracy Lee
- ii. CMP Metadata Framework – led by Ken Sanderson

i. Ecological Health in the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem

- √ The CMP has a vision of an ecologically healthy COCE. To assist the CMP in addressing this vision, a project has been designed to report on the current approaches of monitoring ecological health within the COCE.
- √ Miistakis contacted agencies in the COCE and requested information on ecological health monitoring to make comparisons (similarities and differences), set objectives and select indicators and measures to monitor ecological health.
- √ The report is ready in draft form but we are hoping to get more input from a few more agencies.

ii. CMP Metadata Framework

- √ Not trying to create but wanting to coordinate the databases so it is all in one location. The framework is a way to tap into the different databases so that agencies can use the information more generally.
- √ The “Other Resources” section lists other databases unavailable for distributed queries and that must be accessed directly.
- √ There is a link to add data, to the CMP website and an information page about the CMP and the framework search engine.
- √ Search summaries include a description, URL, then clicking on a title brings you to a single record page with library holding information if available.
- √ There is a lot of good information that no one knows of. The portal will make that information more knowledgeable.

Discussion:

- What are Miistakis plans for continuity in the database; does Miistakis have a long term funding scheme?
 - This is a Crown Managers Partnerships Project – as long as it is used the more that is reflected to the CMP to maintain it.
 - It is also on the workplan to on an annual basis have summer students check it for freshness and awareness.
- BC Ministry of Env is contracting a similar effort for the east Kootenay region. Don Gaten can add to this database.

Panel Presentations – Ecological Health in the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem

Len Broberg – Environmental Studies Program, University of Montana

Assessing Ecosystem Health: An Overview

- Ecological Health – what does it mean? Have intuitive sense but fussy term. There are layers or stages that might move down through.
- Looking at examples of how to frame the concept:
 - √ ICBEMP – defines ecosystem health to include ecological integrity and social and economic integrity.
 - Ecological Integrity – maintaining ecological components and processes.
 - Economic Resiliency – diversity of employment sectors
 - Social Resiliency – civic infrastructure; economic diversity, social/cultural diversity (want to monitor and maintain), amenity infrastructure – do we have these to drive the needs for the social and cultural diversity.
- Use of Indicators – the public desires accounting, how are we doing it. Scientific defensible indicators to derive accounting from.
- Niemi and McDonald did a good job of defining ecological indicators. Need to define:
 - √ Spatial Scale – Looking at population , community , ecosystem, landscape scale
 - √ Temporal Scale – looking at now, where we were, forecasting ahead. Conditions that find unsatisfactory – are we going to look at time forward, remediation and in what time scale.

The constraints on scale include cost and information. As reduce cost, generally get less information. As we increase scientific understanding (with increased information) we also increase the cost.

There is somewhere we reach a balance – a reliable amount of information for an accessible cost.

- In choosing indicators for a project choose those that are best suited for what one wants to accomplish. Suggested that should be ones that
 - i. assess existing and emerging problems
 - ii. allow diagnosis of anthropogenic (and biotic/abiotic) stressors leading to impairment.
 - iii. establish trends
 - iv. allow ease of communication to the public – the Public drives what will happen or not happen.
- Is it possible to get something when it acts first versus tenth and has moved to a state that is not reversible. Something that is sensitive to changes, but not to natural changes –

respond to something new. Something that is measurable, cost-effective, understandable to decision makers and the public

- Might want to add commonality – something that is measured across the COCE, a shared concept of what’s happening across the region.
- Communication results – how to we select what we give the public what they want to know which is:
 - √ What such measurements can tell them about environmental conditions
 - √ What a combination of indicators told them about the environment at broad scales
 - √ Information relating to the status of conditions that they valued highly

Bill Dolan – Parks Canada, Waterton Lakes National Park

Ecological Integrity Monitoring in the Montane Cordillera

- Why is Parks Canada in the business of ecological integrity monitoring? It is part of a process that feeds back to the public. Have a mandate to do a 5 year management plan similar to a “State of the Park” report which is fairly new to the park culture.
- There are 3 key components: 1) Ecological Integrity; 2) Public Education; 3) Visitor experience.
- Parks Canada uses the term Ecological Integrity. The performance expectations are that “All national parks have fully functional ecological integrity monitoring and reporting systems by March 2008.”
- Parks Canada uses indices versus indicators. There will be measures for indices and data to go with it.
- The information that will be presented to the public will be trends (from Poor to Good), and whether the trends are becoming poorer or improving.
- Parks Canada is in the very early stage of developing thresholds and targets.
- One of the next steps may involve partnerships such as through citizen science initiatives.
- When program started Parks Canada was considering no more than 8 indices -helped create some focus, easier to communicate to public.
- Even if indices aren’t measured in the same way across agencies one could still have similar broad expression of trend (from Poor to Good)

Jack Potter – Glacier National Park

Rocky Mountain Inventory and Monitoring Network (ROMN)

- The presentation will be on a program that is part of a larger network.
- The NPS Vital Signs Program is based on legislation.
- NPS responded with the Natural Resource Challenge; a base funding initiative to improve park management and preservation through greater reliance on scientific information.
- It failed at its attempt at measuring ecological health. Not enough money.

- Now the Rocky Mountain Inventory and Monitoring Network is made of 32 networks. Not necessarily geographically linked. Wide variety in the region they were lumped into; idea was to pool resources.
- Rocky Mountain Network and all networks are looking for a parsimonious suite of vital signs that will indicate the health of park ecosystems. Cost is a key factor driving the selection of the suite of vital signs and indicators for networks.
- The general vital signs monitoring objective is to determine status and trends in the condition of select park resources.
- Elements included CESU, Exotic Plant Management Teams and the Vital Signs Network
- Key Aspects of NPS Vital Signs Program
 - √ It is a long-term program. 5 year time frame – some every year, some only every 5 years.
 - √ This is a broad scale program - whenever possible are designing protocols to provide reliable information at the park-wide (and broader) scale.
 - √ Taking an integrative approach, for example, looking at biotic, physical, and chemical vital signs and indicators, including important ecological disturbance and other processes, and developing landscape dynamics monitoring indicators and measures.
 - √ Emphasizing information management.
 - √
- Goals – Vital sign must answer these questions. Legal mandate
 - √ Status and trends in selected indicators
 - √ Early warning of abnormal conditions
 - √ Understand dynamic nature and condition of park ecosystems and reference points for comparisons
 - √ Data to meet legal mandates (e.g. Clean Water Act)
 - √ Means of measuring progress towards natural resource goals
- The Planning for the ROMN Vital Signs was collaborative and peer reviewed - 3 yr+ and 3 phase process which involved a science panel and technical group.
- The ROMN Vital signs for their network are:
 - √ Water Chemistry
 - √ Surface Water Dynamics
 - √ Freshwater communities
 - √ Invasive/Exotic Aquatic Biota
 - √ Invasive/Exotic plants
 - √ Focal Species (Beaver)

The others on the list provided were developed at a national scale.
- Protocols are detailed in the “handbooks” for monitoring. Integrating different indicators into one protocol.
- Watershed Project led by Erin Sexton - call from Congress to know where we are right now. This project is to develop a protocol to do that besides the long term monitoring.

Matthew Coombs – Alberta Environment

- Job involves identifying environmental indicators that can be monitored to assess broad-scale environmental performance of watersheds in southern Alberta.
 - √ I have been considering condition and stressor indicators, so I will briefly review what these are and how they can be used to evaluate environmental performance.
 - √
 - √ Then I will cover what I think is a generic set of potential indicators to assess the state of our watersheds.
 - √
 - √ Data availability is an important issue in terms of using these indicators in State of the Watershed reports, so I will briefly touch on this as I present the indicators.
 - √
 - √ And I hope at the end we can discuss what you think about including a common set of indicators in State of the Watershed reports.
-
- Are using the Water for Life strategy outcomes to examine indicators for land, water quantity, water quality and aquatic and riparian ecosystem health.
 - √ Land indicators are the most important because it is the land use activities and the condition of the land that ultimately cascade down to affect water quantity and quality and aquatic and riparian ecosystem health.
 - √ Water quantity indicators are important because adequate flows are needed to ensure the water quality requirements for human uses and aquatic life are met and to maintain physical habitat for aquatic and riparian ecosystems.
 - √ Water quality indicators measure the different aspects of water quality required for human uses and the protection of aquatic life. Impacts of effluents released from point-sources can be measured and linked to ambient water quality.
 - √ Indicators of aquatic and riparian ecosystem health are important because these are valued biological communities that provide a variety of ecological goods and services.
- When identifying indicators are considering condition and stressor indicators.
 - √ Condition indicators measure biotic or abiotic characteristics in the environment.
 - √ Stressor indicators measure human activities.

Condition indicators tell you how the environment is performing relative to how you want it to perform, and stressor indicators suggest why the environment may not be performing the way you would like it to.
- Condition Indicators
 - √ The most basic land condition indicator proposing to use is the percentage of the total watershed area that is covered with natural vegetation, including ecologically similar, non-native vegetation. Natural vegetation plays a key role in basic hydrologic

functions that are important for natural flow regime, higher water quality, and healthier aquatic and riparian ecosystems.

- √ Growing crops and grazing are widespread stressors in southern Alberta that impact water quantity and quality and aquatic and riparian ecosystem health, so two other land condition indicators that should eventually be included in State of the Watershed reports are soil erosion potentials modelled at the watershed scale and rangeland health assessments.
- Stressor Indicators –
 - √ Human footprint broken down into key land cover types and anthropogenic landscape features as well as all relevant linear disturbances and stream crossings.
 - √ human population density
 - √ dwelling unit density
 - √ agricultural and non-agricultural fertilizer and pesticide use
- It is widely accepted that the more altered the natural flow regime is, the greater the impact on river ecosystems.
- So, the condition indicators proposing for water quantity are based on deviations of the recorded flow regime from natural flows, water conservation objectives defined in the SSRB WMP, and Instream Flow Need values. Alberta Environment already has the capacity to estimate these deviations at gauging stations throughout watersheds, and with more water use data being collected the accuracy of these estimates will improve.
- The water quantity stressor indicators being proposed are based on the amount of water being removed from and returned to streams and rivers as a result of human activities. Accurate measurements of use by all sectors of water users will be needed to determine whether Water for Life targets for increased efficiency and productivity of water use are being met.
- Another stressor indicator for water quantity being proposed is the change in annual runoff rates and volumes for all areas where natural land cover has been altered. These would be predicted from watershed-scale models. This would include increase in annual runoff rates and volumes from all types of developed land. For example, harvested forests, roads and other impervious surfaces, cultivated land, and constructions sites.
- The five key water quality parameters selected that can be used as condition indicators to monitor water quality necessary for all uses are water temperature, dissolved oxygen, nutrients, total suspended solids, and pathogens.
- The water quality stressor indicators proposed are based on the same five key water quality parameters used as condition indicators, but they would be measured in municipal and industrial wastewater effluent.
- By quantifying loadings from point-sources, water quality impairment resulting from point and non-point sources can be distinguished and the largest point sources of contamination can be targeted for improved treatment, more complete monitoring and reporting, and implementation of loading thresholds and targets.

- In terms of selecting condition and stressor indicators, many of the parameters used by the Cows and Fish program are relevant indicators for riparian ecosystem health, and there are a variety of benthic invertebrate and fish community indexes that could be adapted for use in Alberta as indicators.
- I think there needs to be a stronger connection between efforts to improve water supply, water quality, and aquatic and riparian ecosystems and efforts to manage land use.
- Conclusions:
 - √ There needs to be a stronger connection between efforts to improve water supply, water quality, and aquatic and riparian ecosystems and efforts to manage land use.
 - √ The State of the Watershed reports should address this lack of coordination by integrating all four areas of the environment to show these components are closely linked.
 - √ If the State of the Watershed reports can show strong relationships between stressor and condition indicators, then they can make some specific recommendations to both municipal and provincial agencies on ways to improve environmental performance of watersheds.

Ken Soneff – BC Ministry of Environment

Forest and Range Evaluation Program (FREP)

- In the 1980s with logging arose environmental protests. The government established Forest Practices code that were scientifically based with regulations and requirements. So evolved into results based codes.
- It included:
 - √ Objectives set by government.
 - √ Plan & Practice Requirement – plans to comply with objectives by logging companies.
 - √ Compliance & enforcement – to ensure they are doing what said would do in their plans.
 - √ Professional Reliance – dependence on foresters to do what said would do.
 - √ Effectiveness Evaluation –
- Forest and Range Evaluation Program (FREP) – has been in development for approximately 2 years and efforts are currently focusing on the development and testing of indicators for the 11 FRPA resource values.
- This year we are implementing two resource values (riparian and stand-level biodiversity) and pilot testing soils and water quality.
- FREP’s objective is to determine if forest and range policies and practices in BC are achieving government’s objectives for FRPA resource values.
- FREP is an important initiative that will provide:
 - √ a renewed field presence
 - √ important science-based data that will greatly help facilitate knowledge-based decision making

- √ a vehicle for continuous improvement of forest policy, practices and legislation
- √ public confidence and a social licence through a transparent, credible program.

- Two key components to the Evaluation Program:
 - √ resource stewardship monitoring -- the monitoring done by district staff. Generally 2-3 hours on a cutblock
 - √ intensive evaluations -- the evaluation activities generally conducted by regional and branch specialists. Often far more intensive -- may be on a site the better part of a day collecting detailed measurements. Examples -- wildlife tree evaluation, 2004 cutblock assessment, S4 stream...
- The monitoring indicators and protocols that are being developed are designed to answer specific questions concerning individual resource values. They include:
 - √ Riparian Monitoring Indicators
 - √ Stand-level biodiversity Indicators
- Looking to see that legislation is being complied with and then to provide feedback for improvement to legislation.
- Program is in infancy – developing a database, what to do with data when collect it and how to analyse it.
- The outcome of data is reported back to public through reports. Not sure yet on the policy of the full release of data.
- www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/frep

Breakout Groups – Ecological Health in the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem

Group #1

- Common Terminology is important – currently using terms differently. What would be indicators at the COCE scale? Could select three that are biologically based and that are 3 socially based.
- CONDITION MONITORING (in order of importance)
 1. Air and Climate
 2. Water
 3. Biodiversity (Fish, Plants and Wildlife Habitat)
 4. Social Resilience
 5. Economic Diversity
 6. Anthropogenic footprint
- HUMAN USE MONITORING
 1. LinearHuman use stressor monitoring would be good to do in a parallel fashion.

Group #2

- Look at the *Watershed scale*
 - √ water quality and quantity
 - √ standardized sampling approach + number + timing
 - √ Where do we need to consider water monitoring - Flathead (North & Middle Forks), Wigwam, Elk, Castle, Crowsnest, Oldman, Belly, Swan, St. Mary's, Waterton, Sun, Marias
 - √ Variables to test: temp, dissolved O₂, nutrients, TSS, pathogens, heavy metals
 - √ Keystone Species (sensitive, threatened, endangered, umbrella)
 - √ Trends analysis: trends in exotic species (plant + animal + disease)
 - √ Land quality: vegetative cover, change (loss) in critical habitats and corridors (ie: wetlands, riparian corridors, flood plains)
Land Use: population (increase) change, number, where, density, road density (linear) and stream crossings.
- *Human dimension*
 - √ "Cows not condos"
 - √ "Geotourism vs coal fired plants"
 - √ number of stewardship groups (size)
 - √ relative changes in land uses (urban/rural, agriculture etc)
 - √ trends in conservation of (private) land (easements, "Best Management Practices", Parks)
 - √ economic sustainability long term

- ***Protection***

- √ Level of 'representative' ecotypes

Group #3

- Consistent terminology is important
- Choose indicators appropriate to the scale of COCE analysis.
- **CONDITION MONITORING** (common indices)
 - √ Air + Climate
 - √ Water + Watersheds (quality / quantity)
 - √ Aquatic biota
 - √ Landscape measures of health – linear fragmentation; pattern on the landscape
 - √ Age Class/ Serial Stage (forests)
 - √ Extent of habitat / community types and connectivity
 - √ Biodiversity
 - √ Social Resilience
 - √ Economic Diversity
- Impediments to monitoring – no political lawsuit; no resources. Opportunity to drive in statutory direction to build level of commitment.
- Different levels of risk depending on location of ecosystem.

Discussion:

- How to move ahead?
- If we don't have a target it is hard to get to a measure of health. We need targets associated with each of indicator.
- If looking at something for the COCE as a whole how do you pull up to a level that everyone agrees to?
- Because there is so much variation, if want to function as an entity, there must be a common thread to the whole.
- How do you communicate to where you are relative to the condition? Position relative to a measure or state as to say if the condition is staying the same, improving or deteriorating.
- How to draw people to a common vision irrespective of their agency mandate?
- Awareness triggering – If one area is doing well then can share with other areas.
- Ashame if couldn't cross jurisdiction to see if can try to identify 5 indicators that the COCE could have in common to focus on and monitor across all jurisdictions.
- Communication – Common terminology important for public.
- If there are 7 different managers – could agree on what to monitor - then discuss level at which to monitor. Find out existing, find out where holes are.
- There is a table in the Ecological Health report being developed for the CMP by the Miistakis Institute that gives the comparison across the COCE.

- First is to identify what collective goals are important for monitoring.
- Looking at indicator, but should work first from outcome then correlate indicator to outcome.
- Challenge will not be identifying the top five areas to monitor. Challenge will be in maintaining public support, keeping it simple, being fiscally responsible.
- Hard thing is to sell long term monitoring – getting funding. Are you looking at ecosystem to solve a particular issue or for long term monitoring?
- Need to build a constituency of support.
- Outcome based monitoring will help identify things that come up. Key point in how we structure it.

Friday, March 9 2006

Summary – Day 1

Ian Dyson

- The Forum started with Roberta Bondar talk with a very enjoyable Q & A at the end. Her presentation bolsters the importance of what the CMP is doing.
- Mr Abbotts blutness was appreciated
- Enjoyed learning of Mr Priest’s vision of getting the community ahead of curve and recognizing the natural resources of his community. How the community is changing. What worked in past isn’t working today.
- Agency Updates
 - √ WLNP funding demonstrates the personal and agency commitment and the ability to follow through. It is challenging to operate without long term sustainable funding.
 - √ pressures on environment, capital,- challenges of MD with multiple resource pressures, pressure from Mine.
 - √ Progress in AB with cumulative affects – systemic changes slowly happening
- Reoccurring themes appear to be
 - √ succession planning
 - √ broadening bases
 - √ community engagement and support
- Steve Thompson mapping project will definitely put the COCE on the radar in this continent. Enough of a population to draw from.
- The CMP now has a Statagic Plan with a vision. It is well designed so now we need to think on how we can build it.
- There is dedicated support from the Miistakis Institute. The development of the prime data framework for the COCE will bring CMP’s work forward.
- Len Broberg’s provided a good context and introduction to the panel presentations

- We are still all over the map on some issues though but have capture the breakout group discussions for a future technical meeting.
- The CMP will work to come to a clarity of focus in a manner that helps us gain an understanding of this place and gather community support. Develop focus and develop a world class monitoring system.

Discussion:

- Ideas on developing a framework of ecological health at this scale look good. Challenge is to follow up in a reasonable time before loose momentum.
- One challenge is the CMP image and communicating what we're doing. There is a fair amount of trust in each other (Steering Committee members), but colleagues demonstrate a lack of understanding of CMP and commitment to its concepts of the Crown.
- Look at communication strategy on how to build constituency of support outside of people in this room.

Crown Managers Partnership – Strategic Communications

Will Harmon – Public Policy Research Institute, University of Montana

- The report prepared for this forum is drawing on three surveys. Two previous surveys conducted in 2001 and 2003 plus a third survey conducted in 2006 by the Public Policy Research Institute.
- In the 2006 survey there is a sense that the CMP is at a crossroads.
 - √ What is the next step? Have a strategic plan but how do we implement it?
 - √ Political environment is changing – how to adapt.
 - √ Where do we want to be in 2, 5 10 years.
 - √ Quite a bit of overlap between agencies.
- Keep asking is this the direction we want to move in? – even if have strategic plan.
- Current active members value the working relationships, networking and information sharing.
- Member comments:
 - √ CMPs vision and mission are still not clear and not yet bought into.
 - √ Not clear that they are part of the CMP – some participants feeling left out of decision making – don't have ownership.
 - √ Confused over representation, decision making, agenda setting, information gathering, roles and responsibilities.
 - √ Don't even want to participate in survey because they are not members
 How do we bring these people into the CMP?

- Concern over continuity, staff succession, lack of mentoring and constituency building within member agencies.
- Concern over insufficient funding.
- External Communication - Concern that COCE does not resonate with public, communities and outsiders. That's the perception – not sure how true that is. Different than Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem – everyone knows what it is but not same with COCE.
 - √ CMP work is isolated from other players in the region .
 - √ Watershed group – no one know what the CMP does. There is no larger sense of the CMP's purpose. CMP does not communicate with outside groups. No grassroots constituency.
- Lack of MOU/formal charter is a barrier to real progress.
 - √ When does a group decide to formalize the way it works together? It probably is time to do this but may need explicit permission from higher up.
- What products or outcomes does the CMP want to produce?
- Borders create real barriers to collaboration – travel logistics, lack of reciprocity, data formatting etc. Sense that some of the agencies are chipping in as much but just is there away to change that a little.
- So many priorities and not enough time.
- Asked how much time people could commit. General sense: they're swamped with regular jobs; it's hard to find time or money to do work.
- Asked if had sought permission from higher up in their agencies. Some say they are not really members – asked if there is actually an organization, they don't feel they've been invited nor are part of the organization. There is a perception they need to be invited to participate.
- Is there any believe that this group is benefit? People are less aware of Miistakis and their role with the CMP. The roles of the CMP and the Secretariat are not as clear as they should be.

Draft Strategic Communications Report Presentation and Discussion:

- CMP should be profiled not Miistakis unless it is to CMP's benefit. But it's the partnership that is important.
- All of the outreach activity is around the forum so participants are disconnected the rest of the year. See forum and CMP as connected and that is not to CMP's benefit.
- Miistakis should play a bigger role accentuate the benefits of member participation.
- Are we behaving as a professional organization – no we are not.
- A whole budget around getting engagement – good provided have the context; what are the barriers and how to overcome them. Not there and can't be held to a standard of performance yet.

- The CMP is ahead of the ball – because started from bottom up, grew from existing connections. Some feel they've never been part of this connection. See a formal association of land managers of the crown and feel not invited – feel left out.
- Also missing ASRD. The idea that data are not shared. Personal commitment from ASRD has been difficult.
- Want to work with people who want to work with the CMP.
- Need to be more clear about the CMP and the Forum. Can be both.
- Projects of the Miistakis Institute on behalf of the CMP such as collect data across the region – Need to be strategic as the level of how they understand the CMP is directly the level of support that will get around projects for the CMP.
- Is the CMP a partnership or an ad hoc group where people participate as they want or a formal reporting agency? Has the CMP communicate that in a way that the members understand?
- Inter-agency cooperation from the bottom up such as what is seen with the CMP is very unusual.
- Well-established partnership. What does a partnership mean?
- Secretariat – does a lot for the CMP. Have a web-site (a place to draw people in). Doing a good job – how do we improve on this?
- Some members are unsure of their status – members of what? Some said they never heard of the CMP. Some resent being on the member list since they are never asked to comment on the agenda. What are the benefits?
- The CMP has unclear decision-making procedures and protocols and limited communication channels. Some members don't have emails.
- At its root the CMP is about regional cooperation, working around jurisdiction. Why focus on communication – what other option does the CMP have.
- Regional collaboration IS communication.
- Everyone that is invited has differences in interests, values, areas of knowledge and expertise and jurisdiction – those are the barriers. Together can accomplish tasks or goals that could not do alone.
- Communication recognizes that each agency is independent and interdependent and cannot fulfill their mandate unless they recognize they are interdependent.
- Instead of collaboration and cooperation think of it as communication.
- Thinking how to build constituency within member agency. Until internal communication is hammered out then don't see the use to communicate externally, or to do outreach.
- For example the Draft Strategic Plan received no feedback from members. Maybe haven't planted the importance of need to participate and how to do that. Plant seed through communication. Maybe not talking to the right people. Maybe not giving the right marketing pitch.
- Do you want them to participate? Would there be an advantage to have them participate?

- The Steering Committee has be careful of not going to regional office but rather has gone to the line office but probably the regional office is where to go if they express the interest and have the time.
- The CMP needs to:
 - √ identify its purpose
 - √ identify its target audience – the more general the audience the less you have a target audience
 - √ Develop tools to address specific audience – may need to have a few face to face meetings initially
 - √ Develop a monitoring and evaluation plan
- See CMP not as a way to create more work but to work smarter, better by working together. Provide support for their work.
- What are the benefits of belonging to the CMP? When you do participate it does take time – still a down side that needs to be acknowledged.
- Without a problem there isn't a solution. This (the CMP) is a solution but if there isn't a perceived threat then others don't see a need to participate.
- There are a lot of players in the Crown that aren't part of the CMP. Is there a compelling catalyst to work on a regional or subregional level – there are things but are they compelling to draw one out of one's regular work, to add to one's workload. Who perceive threats to the Crown?
- What does the CMP need to do? There needs to be the capacity to do.
- Maybe sending email or calling partners. Where can we be a catalyst? Can't get it all together now but slowly. With limited capacity how can we be smarter.
- **It's about working smarter and strategically not harder.**
- What catalyst? Not just one catalyst is going to do it. Commitment was not quite thought out in first meeting. Take small steps, and also dealing with a broad geography. May need a lot of small catalysts.
- If have a product there must be benefits for the agency that comes to the table.
- Purpose of Communication Strategy:
 - √ Provide accessible, consistent channels to foster and support communication among CMP members.
 - √ Enhance communication back and forth between CMP members and the Steering Committee.
 - √ Establish decision-making protocols for CMP.
 - √ Establish decision-making protocols for the Steering Committee.
 - √ Enhance the engagement and long-term participation of member agencies.
- Who is the audience – CMP member agencies, CMP Steering Committee, Staff (Miistakis Intitute).
- Tools and Strategies:
 - √ Lines of responsibility and accountability should be made clear.

- √ Start a written strategic plan – external and internal. Not just the agency but who in the agency. Go to line office but then maybe go to regional office.
- √ Write it down – more than just talking about it at the forum and a year later coming back and asking what happened – need to be strategic
- √ Communications Task Force / Work Group – a smaller representation of the group that then carries work forward.
- What is the CMP communicating; what message are we sending? There was some agreement that the CMP hasn't worked on this extensively.
- The Steering Committee has been doing it all but not strategically wise.
- Marketing and Communication are part of the same thing.
- Water, landscape and wildlife are why people are interested in this region – regardless of what words you use those three are the focus of interest in this area. If can come up with how to address those issue will get agency and public support.
- Consistent talking points used throughout the agencies – with frequency you get a groundswell that promotes the partnerships.
- How to approach:
 - √ Do a membership review.
 - √ Focus on who is active.
 - √ Who is on the wish list.
 - √ Who has been tried and not getting success.

Get sense of the status – and see how to engage.
- Why limit the steering committee – becomes unmanageable if all members.
- Communication is very complex. Receiver and sender will perceive differently.
- Recommend that CMP develop a Charter – written statement on who we are, how we got together, why we got together, roles and responsibility. Idea is to have some sort of written agreement saying we are working together and why. Doesn't necessarily formalize but helps clarify for members.
- Separate charter – as a way to raise awareness of CMP – what we are, how we work, what are the benefits. Early stage product that communication work group can do – send out to the CMP Steering Committee – then the wish list of members.
- Agencies will ask: How do we tie it back to statutory responsibility or regulatory responsibility? Should be easy to do. This informal approach is good because hard to get legislative agreement that will be accepted by 23 agencies.
- This is an alternative to an MOU so don't have to go up each agency. More for awareness building.
- Examples of MOU or Charter together – Does this approach make sense? Yes, so long as the CMP feels comfortable with it. Charter is a good first informal step - should be easy to do as long as it fits in with the agency mandate. Creating a better common understanding by working through the words together.
- MOU are possible but capacity is an issue.
- Not many places where see transboundary and regional agency cooperation.

- The draft document by Will can be turned into a communication plan.
- Ground Rules – how you actually behave in meetings.
 - √ Challenge ideas not people.
 - √ If you say no to something then obligated to come up with a constructive alternative that is of consideration for the group – can't just say no, need to work with the group.
 - √ Deliberation and recording dissenting opinions and come up with decision that everyone agrees with.
- The CMP has never talk about the culture that it wants to create.
- Rules can stifle things. If that's how members feel then the CMP's culture of collaboration need not be presented in rules. The collegial respect and how that has come about, how the culture plays out should be document for new members also for succession.
- While the group at the Forum understands it seems that others may not understand or feel they don't fit into the culture and a charter would allow for clarity and opening the door.
- Will is very interested in communication and Matt and Will are very interested in participating on conference calls to see progress with the CMP.
- Commitments in budget and staffing to communication issues.
- Web site (things can do to increase web site use):
 - √ members only page
 - √ Blogging – this is where the future is for the younger folks who are going to blogs for news, groups.
- The National Geographic COC Map Project website will bring more attention to identifying the name COCE to the region. Whole umbrella is to foster regional stewardship collaboration – so same focus as CMP but not just managers. CMP would be very much a part of that – Section on Crown regional network with member profile with links to their sites.
- The more the COC term is used (tourism, stewardship etc) the less it is looked at as being identified with one entity but rather a region.
- Link page on website – builds on partnerships. Take away from unknown.
- Interviewees commented that would like to see regular posting of meeting minutes from Steering Committee meetings.
- Logo & Letterhead – Need to put thought in how others see the logo.
- Wouldn't hurt to hire PR firm. Outside communication specialist brought into Team (even if aren't involved otherwise) and meet quarterly to support brainstorming.
- Try to have more people get involved in setting the agenda.
- How to mentor people in agency by bringing them to the forum.
- In between issues have specific workshop or place based work shops.
- Drafting an external communication plans – communicating who you are to other people and how you communicate when they respond to you. Part of sender and receivership.

- There is no point in doing unless can evaluate what you are doing – biennial review. Check how things are going. And a more comprehensive 5 yr survey to see how members are feeling.

External Communication:

- √ Outreach – send out message to inform but don't need response
- √ Partner – middle
- √ Empower – really start working with NGO; when find a common ground
- Know the audience you are communicating to
- Tools & Strategies:
 - √ Integrate scientific value with public values through Joint Fact Finding.
 - √ Talking Points – a number of things need to be defined. All end up using consistent talking points – so when people hear it it is the same and there is no mixed message.
 - √ Web site: Regularly updated information – time and money question again.
 - √ Visioning and Future Scenarios - Models showing development progression concerns are great tools for public awareness and understanding.
 - √ Regular surveys - Understanding ; awareness and satisfaction – important elements of external communication

Discussion on Direction for the Steering Committee

- Move forward with Strategic Plan – work plan is well defined
- Defining indicators discussion at this forum was positive. Need to define more specifically then develop a monitoring network – how to set it up and find funding.
- Communication strategy – lots of food for thought
- Wait for Lincoln Policy workshop to move head ahead; May 30/31
- Need younger steering committee members and women.

Next Forum (2008) will be in Montana spearheaded by the Flathead Basin Commission.

APPENDIX A

Participant List

Anderson, Terry

Ecosystem Officer
BC Ministry of Environment
401 - 333 Victoria Street, Nelson BC
V1L 4K3
Email: terry.anderson@gov.bc.ca

Blair, Rod

Field Unit Superintendent
Parks Canada – Waterton Lakes
National Park
Waterton Park, Alberta T0K 2M0
Email: rod.blair@pc.gc.ca

Broberg, Len

Associate Professor
University of Montana
Environmental Studies, Rankin Hall,
University of Montana,
Missoula, MT 59812
Email: lbroberg@selway.umt.edu

Butler, Heather

BC Ministry of Environment
Email : Heather.Butler@gov.ab.ca

Coombs, Matthew

Environmental Indicators Specialist –
Southern Region
Alberta Environment
3rd Floor, Provincial Building
200-5th Avenue S.
Lethbridge, Alberta T1J 4L1
Email: matthew.coombs@gov.ab.ca

Crowley, Sue

Ecosystem Officer
BC Ministry of Environment
P.O. Box 2949 Invermere B.C. V0A 1K0
Email: sue.crowley@gov.bc.ca

Dolan, Bill

Chief Resource Conservation
Waterton Lakes National Park
Waterton Park, Alberta T0K 2M0
Email: bill.dolan@pc.gc.ca

Dyson, Ian

Head, Environmental Management
Alberta Environment
2nd Floor, Provincial Building
200-5th Avenue S.
Lethbridge, Alberta T1J 4L1
Email: ian.dyson@gov.ab.ca

Gall, Mike

Ecosystem Officer
BC Ministry of Environment
205 Industrial Rd G Cranbrook BC
V1C 7G5
Email: mike.gall@gov.ab.ca

Greenaway, Guy

A/ Executive Director
Miistakis Institute for the Rockies
c/o Environmental Design
2500 University Drive NW
Calgary AB T2N 1N4
Email: guy@rockies.ca

Hammerquist, Will
Montana Lt Governor's Office

Harmon, Will
Senior Associate
Public Policy Research Institute
The University of Montana
516 N. Park Avenue
Helena, MT 59603
Email: will.harmon@bresnan.net

Hayden, Brace
Regional Issues Specialist
Glacier National Park
P.O. Box 128
West Glacier, Montana 59936
Email: brace_hayden@nps.gov

Holm, Mick
Superintendent
Glacier National Park
P.O. Box 128
West Glacier, Montana 59936
Email: mick_holm@nps.gov

Holmes, Peter
Ecosystem Biologist
BC Ministry of Environment
P.O. Box 2949 Invermere B.C. V0A 1K1
Email: Peter.N.Holmes@gov.ab.ca

Kendall, Katherine
Research Ecologist
USGS Glacier Field Station
Glacier National Park
West Glacier, MT 59936-0128
Email: kkendall@usgs.gov

Martin, Doug
Ecosystem Biologist
BC Ministry of Environment
205 Industrial Rd G Cranbrook BC
V1C 7G5
Email: Doug.Martin@gov.bc.ca

Moy, Rich
Chief, Montana Water Management
Bureau
Montana Department of Natural
Resources and Conservation
P.O. Box 201601
Helena, MT 59620-1601
Email: rmoy@mt.gov

Murtha, Mike
Park Planner
Parks Canada
Box 900 Banff, Alberta T1L 1K0
Email: mike.murtha@pc.gc.ca

Patterson, Daisy
University of Montana

Petersen, Derek
Integrated Land Use Specialist
Parks Canada
Box 220, Radium Hot Springs, BC,
V0A 1M0
Email: derek.petersen@pc.gc.ca

Pinto, Madalena
Administration Assistant
Miistakis Institute for the Rockies
c/o Environmental Design
2500 University Drive NW
Calgary AB T2N 1N4
Email: maddy@rockies.ca

Potter, Jack

Assistant Chief, Science and Resource
Management
Glacier National Park
National Parks Service,
P.O. Box 128 West
Glacier, Montana 59936
Email: jack_potter@nps.gov

Riddle, Mary

Compliance Coordinator
Glacier National Park
P.O. Box 128
West Glacier, Montana 59936
Email: mary_riddle@nps.gov

Sexton, Erin

Senior Research Scientist
Flathead Lake Biological Station,
The University of Montana,
32125 Bio Station Lane, Polson, MT,
USA 59860-9659
Email: erin.sexton@montana.edu

Smith, Janice

Communication Specialist
Parks Canada
Waterton Lakes National Park,
Waterton Park, Alberta T0K 2M0
Email: janice.smith@pc.gc.ca

Soneff, Ken

Forest Science Manager
BC Ministry of Forests and Range
Email: Ken.Soneff@gov.bc.ca

Soobotin, Al

Section Head, Ecosystems
BC Ministry of Environment
401 - 333 Victoria Street

Nelson BC V1L 4K3
Email: Al.Soobotin@gov.bc.ca

Stetski, Wayne

Regional Manager
BC Ministry of Environment
205 Industrial Rd G Cranbrook BC
V1C 7G5
Email: Wayne.Stetski@gov.bc.ca

Stewart, Neil

Councillor
MD of Pincher Creek No. 9
P.O. Box 279, Pincher Creek, AB
T0K 1W0
Email: nstewart@mdpincercreek.ab.ca

Thesen, Cliff

Area Manager – Southwest Area
Alberta Community Development
Room 416, Administration Building
909-3rd Avenue North
Lethbridge, Alberta T1H 0H5
Email: cliff.thesen@gov.ab.ca

Zandbergen, Jeremy

District Engineer
BC Ministry of Transportation
130 - 10th Ave. S, Cranbrook, BC
V1C 2N1
Email: jeremy.zandbergen@gov.bc.ca

APPENDIX B
Agenda
CROWN OF THE CONTINENT MANAGERS PARTNERSHIP
ANNUAL FORUM
Prestige Inn, Cranbrook, British Columbia
March 7-9, 2007

Wednesday March 7, 2007	
4:00 p.m.	Hotel room check-in – Prestige Inn Cranbrook, BC
4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.	Conference registration
7:00 p.m.	Keynote Speaker – Is Our Planet in a Meltdown or Evolving Roberta Bondar: Astronaut, Scientist, Physician, Pioneer

Thursday March 8, 2007	
7:00 – 8:30	Registration
7:30 – 8:30	Breakfast
8:30 – 9:00	Welcome and Introductions Katherine Tenesse – Treaty negotiator, Ktunaxa Nation Chief Treaty Negotiator Jim Abbott – Member of Parliament, Kootenay Columbia Ross Priest – Mayor of Cranbrook
9:00 – 10:15	Agency Updates
10:15 – 10:45	Break - Hosted by B.C. Ministry of Environment
10:45 – 11:00	National Geographic Geotourism Project Update Steve Thompson – National Parks Conservation Association
11:00 – 12:00	Steering Committee Report to Forum
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch
1:00 – 2:45	Panel Presentations – Ecological Health in the CofC Introductory Presentation: Len Broberg, University of Montana Presentations from five Crown of the Continent Ecosystem agencies:

	<p>Waterton Lakes National Park – Bill Dolan Glacier National Park – Jack Potter Alberta Environment – Mathew Coombs B.C. Forest and Range Evaluation Program – Ken Soneff</p> <p>Each presenter will speak to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) How do you define ecological health? 2) How/what do you monitor? Indicators used? 3) Have you defined targets and thresholds? 4) How do address issues of scale?
2:45 – 3:15	Break
3:15	<p>Participatory Panel Discussion</p> <p>Breakout group discussions will be followed by an open panel dialogue on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What are the impediments to monitoring for ecological health at and agency scale versus a Crown scale? 2) What additional resources (volunteers, academics, citizens etc) have you used to monitor ecological health? 3) What indicators are appropriate at the Crown scale and how would this complement what is being done at the local scale?
5:00	Adjourn Day 1
5:30pm	Drinks and Networking Session
6:30pm	<p>Dinner</p> <p>Dinner presentation – Assessing Bear Density at a Landscape Scale: The Northern Divide Grizzly Bear Project Kate Kendall, US Geological Survey, Glacier Field Station</p>

Friday March 9, 2007	
8:00 – 9:00	Breakfast
9:00 – 9:15	Welcome – Summary Day 1
9:15 – 11:30	<p>Strategic Communications for the Crown Managers Partnership</p> <p>Will Harmon and Cassie Hemphill, Lincoln Institute for Land Policy Brief presentation and research update, followed by a facilitated discussion on communication options for the CMP</p>
11:30 – 11:45	Confirm direction from CMP to Steering Committee
11:45	Adjourn meeting