



# **BC BUDGET 2020 PRESENTATIONS**



## **Committee Members**

Bob D'Eith, MLA Maple Ridge-Mission (chair);  
Dan Ashton, MLA Penticton (deputy chair);  
Doug Clovechok, MLA Columbia River-Revelstoke  
Rich Coleman, MLA Langley East  
Mitzi Dean, MLA Esquimalt-Metchosin;  
Ronna-Rae Leonard, MLA Courtenay-Comox;  
Nicholas Simons, MLA Powell River-Sunshine Coast

## **Reference**

Kamloops and District Fish and Game Club, T. Koester – June 12, 2019 – pages 2 – 4

BC Wildlife Federation, Al Martin – Courtenay, June 13, 2019 – pages 4 – 6

BCWF Region 2 Lower Mainland President and BCWF Vice-President Chuck Zuckerman – Vancouver, June 14, 2019 – pages 7 – 10

Spruce City Wildlife Association, Dustin Snyder – Prince George, June 18 , 2019 – pages 11 – 14

BCWF Region 7B Peace-Liard President and Chair BCWF Wildlife Allocation Committee Gerry Paille – Fort St. John, June 19, 2019 – pages 15 - 19

BCWF Region 5 Cariboo President Ken Last Quesnel, June 19, 2019 – pages 20 - 23

## KAMLOOPS AND DISTRICT FISH AND GAME ASSOCIATION

**T. Koester:** Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you. I met with the group last year with Gord Bacon, and we brought up two concerns that we felt needed a lot of extra funding. One was steelhead. One was wildlife habitat. I'm happy to say that the provincial government did increase funding in those areas. I think it had a lot more to do with our parent organization, the B.C. Wildlife Federation, than it did with Gord and I. But anyway, that was appreciated.

Our presentation this year.... Our request is really a bit different. We're a club of hunters and fishermen in the Kamloops area. We have just 200 members right now. Our request for increased funding is for B.C. Parks.

[1845]

Now, that may seem a little strange, but we work really cooperatively with a number of agencies. One is B.C. Parks. We work with the fisheries and the wildlife biologists and the B.C. Conservation Foundation on any number of projects. It may appear that a request for extra funding for B.C. Parks would be more an administrative issue for them

FGS - 20190612 PM - Kamloops 034/lsh/1845

the fisheries and the wildlife biologists and the B.C. Conservation Foundation on any number of projects. It may appear that our request for extra funding for B.C. Parks would be more an administrative issue for them: that they need to allocate funds in the areas we want them to. But we, continually.... When we approach them for a joint project, it's: "We have no money."

Most of the park plans are a five-year plan, and they're supposed to be reviewed every five years. It's really difficult. So I'm just putting a boost in here to increase funding for B.C. Parks, not necessarily for the big projects — you know, more parks or more campsites and that sort of thing — but the local, cooperative projects that go on. And I'm giving you four examples of where we worked with B.C. Parks and why we think it's important for the funding to be increased.

Walloper Lake is near Kamloops. I don't know if you're familiar with it. There is an aeration project on it, for the winter, to keep the fish alive. We're really involved in that — setting up the aerators and the fences and taking them down.

Every year, we have a family fishing day in February, and this year we had about 400 people there — many international students from TRU and international students from the school district, as well as local families. We set up a lunch program, give a free lunch, and someone's there to clean the fish if any people wish to keep their fish. It's a really fantastic way to get people to learn about ice fishing or just get into fishing.

---

In fact, this year we had a request from a local elementary school. Ten of us — I was one of them — spent a day on Walloper Lake with 24 kindergarten students, lots of parents and lots of help. You want an experience? That was just a fantastic day. But the facility itself — there is a wharf there. There's a boat launch, but it's really in rough condition. Every time we approach B.C. Parks and say, "This needs some

improvement," they say: "We have no funds." We feel that if their budget was increased, we would be able to do something there.

This coming Sunday, Father's Day, we do a family fishing day. It's a provincial day. It's a free fishing day, and we'll, again, provide a free lunch. We'll have several hundred people, and 15 to 20 of us will be there with our boats to take families fishing that don't have an opportunity to do that. That facility really needs some improvements.

The other examples.... I'll be more brief. Pine Park is part of Lac du Bois Grasslands Protected Area. It's right on Tranquille River. The stream to sea program, which was the old salmon enhancement program, where kids could raise coho salmon in the classroom, then release them into the river. Every school day in May, there are students out there releasing salmon.

We, as volunteers, 10 of us, went in and volunteered for a full day to prepare the site for those kids. We don't mind providing the free labour, but the facility for the washroom.... Parks continually says: "We can't upgrade the water supply because we have no funds." It's an area that gets a tremendous amount of use by the public.

Lac du Bois Grasslands burrowing owl project — we have been involved in that for many years. We have several club volunteers who are just dedicated to that. The habitat's changing. It's drier. The owls are having some problems because the mice aren't there like they normally are. We have to go in, as volunteers, and try and improve that. We have a lot of cooperation from the local ranchers. But there needs to be some work there on the habitat, and B.C. Parks needs to be able to put some funds into that.

Our last example is the Roche Lake Provincial Park, which is just south of Kamloops. It gets tremendous use by fishermen and campers. From all over the province — actually, all over western North America — people come to Roche Lake.

[1850]

We tried, a couple of years ago, to get some trails put in there, working with B.C. Parks. No money for trails. They're just.... It can't happen. So we do have some issues with B.C. parks, you know, over access, such as Paul Lake. But we cooperate

FGS - 20190612 PM - Kamloops 035/ebp/1850

Roche Lake.

We tried, a couple of years ago, to get some trails put in there, working with B.C. Parks. No money for trails. They just said that it can't happen. So we do have some issues with B.C. Parks over access, such as Paul Lake, but we cooperate with them in many, many projects — and with other groups. That's our request: that you would really

---

look at increasing the B.C. parks. Here I am, representing a group of hunters and fishermen, saying: "Let's put money into Parks, because we do work with them really carefully on these projects for wildlife and fish."

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Thank you very much, Tom. I appreciate that. It's interesting because it does give a different perspective to organizations like the wilderness societies and others that have come to present to us on parks, specifically. Now you've given another perspective on it, and I do appreciate that, Tom. Don't ever think that your contribution to this process is not.... You said last year.... I remember the presentations you make. These kinds of stories do have an impact. Please continue to make them.

**T. Koester:** That's why we've brought this topic. We wanted to just kind of come at it from a different angle.

**D. Clovechok:** Thank you, Tom, for your presentation. Anybody that comes in here with a camel hat.... I'm from the East Kootenay. I wet a line, and I pull a trigger. So I know what this is all about. I just want to know: has the B.C. Wildlife Federation offered any help or assistance in that? Your advocating for parks is wonderful, by the way. Has the BCWF offered up any help for this?

**T. Koester:** Not specifically with B.C., no — not on our projects. We kind of do that on a.... They have some major projects going on. Actually, we have a meeting tomorrow. I'm going to find out about the wetlands projects. We have some wetlands projects in the Kamloops area. Our club is going to be getting involved in that, but not in these specific....

**D. Clovechok:** Well, keep up the great work. I appreciate it.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Any other comments, thoughts? Okay, well, thank you very much, Tom. We really appreciate your coming.

**D. Ashton (Deputy Chair):** Thank you again for coming.

**T. Koester:** I'm not nearly as nervous this time as I was the last time.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Practise, practise.

---

## **B.C. WILDLIFE FEDERATION**

**A. Martin:** Very well, thanks, Bob. It's a pleasure to be able to present to you again. I know you've got a difficult job with many competing interests, so I'll be to the point and very brief. I provided you with a selection of overheads. I won't read them out. The first two basically set context.

The first one is: we've got an environmental crisis across the province. I like to call it the BFF problem, and it doesn't mean "best friends forever." It's bugs, it's fire, and it's fibre. It's changing our landscapes. It's changing the sustainability of fish and wildlife habitat, natural resources we depend on, and it's changing the functioning and resilience of our watersheds. So that's a problem.

I guess the next issue is: well, what do we do about it? Certainly, I think there needs to be a greater investment in maintaining those functioning landscapes and watersheds for ecological, for economic and for social reasons. That is critical to maintaining the natural diversity of our environment.

A lot of the issues around climate have been dealt with by increasing efficiencies and reducing consumption of fuels in the initial stages. Certainly, in terms of the long term, B.C. is a bit player in terms of consumption of energy, but it's not in terms of our natural heritage, which needs investment in order to maintain the diversity and values that are so important, both to Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

We have four specific recommendations. We've made them before. B.C. Wildlife Federation is a non-partisan conservation organization, 42,000 members. Certainly, we've made presentations to this committee before and to parties on all sides of the House.

[0955]

Our first recommendation is to establish governance and funding models for fish and wildlife. Certainly, all parties have moved that forward, and we appreciate the program

FGS - 20190613 AM - Courtenay 024/amm/0955

Our first recommendation is to establish a governance and funding model for fish and wildlife. Certainly, all parties have moved that forward, and we appreciate the progress that's being made on that.

Our second recommendation. There's a long history in terms of forestry as a foundation of the economy, particularly in rural B.C. We think that the public trust and public interest in forest management needs to be improved, and we have a number of recommendations around improving the Forest and Range Practices Act — specifically, having objectives that are place-based, community-based and preserve the functioning of our landscapes and watersheds.

Our third recommendation is that nothing's done overnight. We do have a Forest Practices Board, but we think their responsibility should be expanded to all the activities that occur across our landscapes and watersheds so that you have a body that is looking at the cumulative effects of development — where the limits are and where we should improve our regulatory regime, our enforcement, our science and other activities that are required to

support forest management.

And finally.... I think you've already heard this before around watershed sustainability — the previous speaker. We collaborate with a number of other groups and see the need for a watershed sustainability fund. There are tremendous ecosystem goods and services that come out of having functioning watersheds, and there are two components to this. One is a regulatory component, and the other is a stewardship component. And I think with a fund that's focused on an area of provincial jurisdiction that looks at a long-term, strategic approach, we'll be much better off than one-offs. Certainly, I commend the government for their Pacific salmon restoration and innovation fund, but it's short-term. It's one-off. I'm sure it will do a lot of good, but it's not strategic, and it doesn't allow you to adapt and improve over time in terms of your investment.

Those are my comments. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity again, and I look forward to your report.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Thanks, Alan.

Questions?

**M. Dean:** Thanks for your work and for your presentation. I'm interested in how your work contributes to reconciliation and how Indigenous communities are involved in the work and in setting priorities.

**A. Martin:** Well, I think that having a.... In terms of fish and wildlife governance, the First Nations have an Aboriginal right to fish and hunt. That right would be very hollow if there was no wildlife or no fisheries across the province. So I think that working collaboratively and collectively is very unifying in terms of dealing at a community basis. And when I say a community basis, I mean both Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities. And certainly, there have been steps forward, such as the moose roundtable in the Cariboo, where Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups, industry and others were working together for a common sustainability outcome. In that case, how do you return moose abundance across the landscape in the Cariboo, which is a concern to all.

**D. Clovechok:** Thank you very much for your presentation, and thank you for the work that the BCWF does. It's really phenomenal. I'm from the Kootenays. One of the slides that you've got in your package talks about lack of investment in the fishing and wildlife populations. I couldn't be more in agreement with you, so I'd like to hear from you what some of those solutions might look like.

**A. Martin:** Well, I think some of the solutions are an independent fund where you can leverage community, financial and technical support. Do you spend the money on those activities that are required to get those programs going?

[1000]

Certainly, we've seen other funds where, for example, \$10 million has been committed to wildlife next year in the FLNRORD budget. If that was put in an independent fund, the leverage ratios for things such as the Pacific Salmon Foundation are 7 to 1. Those could be spent on.

Certainly, we've seen other funds where, for example, \$10 million has been committed to wildlife next year in the FLNRORD budget. If that was put in an independent fund, the leverage ratios for things such as the Pacific Salmon Foundation are 7 to 1. Those could be spent on science. They could be spent on inventory, monitoring, collaborative programs with First Nations. There are a number of opportunities for doing that.

**D. Clovechok:** So that would be independent of government then, much like the B.C. freshwater fish society.

**A. Martin:** Well, you could have a fund within government or outside of government. The governance is less important than having both Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups advising the minister on how to best spend funding to maintain the sustainability of the habitats and fish and wildlife they support.

**D. Clovechok:** One of the key issues, I think, around this is if you took it outside of government — and disagree with me if you want — it would allow non-profits to contribute into that fund, much like the B.C.... That would be a....

**A. Martin:** It would. Yes, absolutely. The Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation is an example.

**D. Clovechok:** Exactly, yeah. Right now they're handcuffed, because they can't do that.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Thank you very much. Nice to see you again and thanks for all your work for this important issue — appreciate the presentation.



## **CHUCK ZUCKERMAN**

**C. Zuckerman:** Yes. Absolutely. I'm a little bit used to this — last speaker on a Friday afternoon. With the last name of Zuckerman, I was always presenting at the end of the week anyway. So I'm kind of used to it. It worked well until that grade 7 teacher reversed the order, and I was first up Monday without a report.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** It backfired on you there, didn't it, Chuck?

**C. Zuckerman:** It did so. Okay.

FGS - 20190614 AM - Vancouver 088/lsh/1615

Zuckerman, I was always presenting at the end of the week anyway. So I'm kind of used to it. It worked well until that grade 7 teacher reversed the order, and I was first up Monday without a report.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** It backfired on you?

**C. Zuckerman:** It did so.

Okay. Hon. committee members, I'm Chuck Zuckerman, vice-president of the B.C. Wildlife Federation. This organization represents 100,000 licensed hunters, 300,000 licensed anglers, an equal number of recreational shooters and twice as many outdoor enthusiasts, as well as all the things that walk, swim and fly in the province. It is my pleasure to explain how this budget affects all our lives.

I'm speaking to you today, reflecting the concerns of the Lower Mainland branch of the B.C. Wildlife Federation. Regarding the use of crown lands, we believe that the proposed budget does not do enough for all the people and others who call British Columbia home and are dependent on the land, the fish and wildlife for their sustenance and enjoyment. The budget does not protect our resources in the way our provincial motto is emblematic of — the government's ultimate responsibility to be committed to the ideal of splendour without diminishment.

You have the unenviable task of spending our limited finances for a variety of important ministries. You must decide the ascension of priorities between homelessness, health, education, safety, forest fires and their remediation, just to mention a few.

We believe that one of the problems that the budget committee faces is that when a ministry does not meet defined, measurable expectations, the committee may still be pressured to fully fund similar failing initiatives, but under a different heading.

B.C.'s 2020 budget — B.C.'s climate action plan over three years is \$902 million. In 2016, the ministry received \$1.38 billion. So there's a shortfall of \$483 million there. So 2019 changes to the B.C. environmental assessment project is \$9 million. However, in 2016, the assessment office received \$11.8 million and the appeals board received \$2 million.

If we're spending \$9 million now, how is \$2 million with the appeal board, going to be able to process all the assessment that is going through on new projects? So \$9 million only represents 0.07 percent of the 2016 budget of the \$13.9 million. So 2019 budget allocates \$20 million to increase oversight of mining operations.

Yet, in 2016, there was \$5 million more given. But that wasn't enough to prevent the Mount Polley disaster that is still going to reflect pollution in our province for at least the next 5, 10 years, if not forever.

The management plan for.... It's a three-year spread from 2019. It breaks down to \$37 million a year. In 2016, there was \$21 million per year for fire management. Sounds like a lot of money. However, in 2016, the firefighting cost was \$380 million, ten times as much as allocated. So 2017, the firefighting cost was \$500 million. That's almost 15 times as much. Again, in 2018, firefighting cost was \$350 million. Again, that's ten times as much as is being budgeted.

The budget properly, in our opinion, allocates 74 percent to health, education, social services. However, of the remaining 26 percent, only 1.4 percent is for FLNRORD, the ministry that's supposed to provide land management throughout the province, and 0.4 percent for the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy, to improve the viability of landscapes and watersheds that directly impact our way of life and the province's motto.

Ignominiously, this results in the following: there is no specified funding for improving wildlife management, even though this is specifically identified as a priority in the business plan of the FLNRORD Ministry and the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change for species at risk. There's no additional funding for the conservation officers service, who protects our resources. The funding is the same as it was in the 1970s. There is no funding for fisheries or watershed initiatives, required to match the federal government funding of fish habitat restoration and the different clubs throughout the province that have salmonid enhancement programs.

We hope that the government can transfer funds to meet the needs outlined in this submission. I've added an appendix from the newspaper articles regarding the firefighting initiatives of 2017-18 and the convention resolutions we had.

[1620]

One problem is backcountry tenures, whereby, specifically, they have helicopter access to migration patterns through calving situations for goats on Mount Cheam and throughout the north. This resource use for recreational is impacting

FGS - 20190614 AM - Vancouver 089/jms/1620

whereby specifically that have helicopter access to migration patterns, to calving situations for goats on Mount Meachen and throughout the north. This resource use for recreational is impacting upon the outdoors and the habitats that are there.

Another one — we need a biologist oversight. We want to have provincial-registered professionals be reinstated and approve their recommendations and let the provincial resource managers implement biologist oversight. The

last one is glyphosates and other systemic herbicides — using in the clearcuts throughout the province. Additionally, I put in the pie chart, and I put in the budget for 2016, referencing a spreadsheet that you could have a look at. Thank you very much.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Thanks, Chuck — appreciate it.

**N. Simons:** You mentioned Mount...

**C. Zuckerman:** Mount Cheam.

**N. Simons:** Mount Cheam. Okay. I'm just thinking in my riding, we have a lot of area that's ungulate range. You think that there needs to be a better oversight or an expansion or re-evaluation of what we set aside?

**C. Zuckerman:** In the appendices, these resource companies are coming in — this is for recreational activities — with 30-year leases on Crown land. They're building lifts and restaurants on tops of the mountains, which is in the caribou migration route as well as the calving for the goats and mountain sheep as well. That's a 30-year lease. There is no provincial oversight in giving out this. They go to the front-desk counter. They help fill out the application form. Right now throughout the Fraser Valley, they're being given access to the tops of the mountain ranges and further up the province.

This is something.... In the Grand Canyon, they have similar types of helicopter skiing, helicopter viewing and that. Sometimes, they have 50 helicopters in the air at the same time. If you're trying to give birth to an ungulate, you have to admit that that might interfere a little bit — as well as the migration routes. We would like to have a coordinated strategy throughout the province about this land tenure that's being done.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Any other questions?

Well, thank you very much, Chuck. I appreciate you. You were the last meeting of our week, but it was all very well presented. Thank you very much for your time.

**C. Zuckerman:** Thank you, sir.

## SPRUCE CITY WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION

**D. Snyder: Okay. Perfect.**

First off, thank you all for the opportunity and for coming up and not only listening to myself but all of us with concerns and asks and the whole works. We appreciate the opportunity to engage.

I just want to give a little bit of history. This is my third year doing this, and the last couple of years I've had a strict sheet, and my wife times me the night before to see if I can get through it all in time. Last year, I had the mayor of Vanderhoof, Gerry Thiessen, tell me: "Dustin, you're reading off your sheet too much. Speak from the heart. Look at them. Make some eye contact. That sort of thing."

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Very good advice.

**D. Snyder:** So I left the sheet, and I just scribbled some notes. I don't even know if I can read all these, so I'm mostly going to be speaking from the heart here.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Okay. Your time's up, Dustin.

**D. Snyder:** My name is Dustin Snyder, I'm the vice-president of Spruce City Wildlife Association. I've been involved with them for, probably, three or four years now. First off, last year I'd asked for an investment in salmon. I'd just like to acknowledge that there has been significant investment in salmon. I definitely appreciate that, and we can see some of that making some progress through PSF as well as through the BCSRAF, that hopefully some funding is going to be announced from there soon.

One thing that I'd like to bring up is fish passage concerns. So the sheet that kind of went around there that I brought is some notes from the B.C. fish passage technical working group. I'm not going to go through all their notes there, but what they focus on mostly is resource roads, forestry roads and that sort of thing. When you look at these numbers here, that doesn't include any highways or any issues that fall under the Ministry of Transportation, but as you can see here, just for resource roads, the number they have there.... At the rate that they're working, they will finish all of them in 8,000 years. However, that's if no more roads are built. So just a generally unrealistic target there.

The pictures below that I took myself. So this year, I'll be going out to that same spot. This is Cross Creek. It's in the Babine Lake Watershed.

[1755]

This is a spawning creek for sockeye as well as a rearing stream for trout, and kokanee spawn in there and rear in there as well. The picture on the left is what it looked like when my dad and I got there. This is our third visiting that site, and our third year filing a complaint there. On the right.

FGS - 20190618 PM - Prince George 024/img/1755



This is a spawning creek for sockeye as well as rearing stream for trout, and kokanee spawn and rear in there as well.

The picture on the left is what it looked like when my dad and I got there. This is our third year visiting that site and our third year filing a complaint there. On the right is what the culvert itself looks like and looked like last year. You can see how the culvert is kind of forced up in the middle, and all of these boulders are piled in front. This is a Ministry of Transportation culvert. It does impede fish passage 100 percent. Juveniles cannot get through. Again, you can see the amount of water flowing around and actually underneath a break under the culvert. It then kind of spills out the other side, so fish cannot get through.

Another example that I've visited multiple times is Kenneth Creek, just east of here. The chinook in that stream have continued to decline and are now COSEWIC recommended for endangered. The provincial species of bull trout, which is also listed at risk or a species of concern also travels and feeds in that creek as well.

The minister has acknowledged that Kenneth Creek does have a failing culvert. Thank you to my local MLA for bringing that up. However, it is beyond an environmental concern now and, I guess, has fallen into a capital project concern, which means that environment has nothing to do with it. The money needs to wait to show up, which is extremely concerning from my side, seeing the endangered chinook kind of struggle to get up there.

We spent 500 hours of volunteer time last year in the region trying to catch our brood stock. In that 500 hours, we came up with 62 eggs. That's 62 individual eggs. We found sex ratios that are all over the place. Nobody in the region is monitoring salmon. Nobody is really doing it. Big piles of work to help them or invest in them. In talking to multiple contacts, it doesn't sound like anybody within this upper region is going to be getting any of that BCSRAF money either.

Next, onto the wildlife side of things: biodiversity in beautiful B.C. B.C. holds 25 percent of the world's grizzlies, 30 percent of the world's bald eagles and 60 percent of the world's mountain goats. Caribou, steelhead and moose, all once plentiful, and very iconic creatures, are now, in some cases, potentially going to be memories, something that our grandkids or kids only hear about or see in books.

I believe, and I'm sure you have heard or will hear, that it is necessary to dedicate 100 percent of funds from fishing and hunting back into the resource. Even having said that, multiple people in the hunting world believe that we get a pretty good deal on our hunting licences. If hunting licence fees were increased, I believe most, if not all, hunters would support that if we were guaranteed that money was going back into the resource. However, any increase without the dedication of those funds would likely not be seen as well.

I also believe that all users should contribute to wildlife, salmon, just outdoors in general. Wildlife viewing, ecotourism, mining, forestry — we are all using the same resource, even though they are managed differently or managed separately in separate silos or in separate offices. Folks especially like wildlife viewing and ecotourism. Those do have long-term impacts on the animals and being around the animals and that sort of thing.

With a lot of the fish and wildlife stuff, I've been somewhat concerned, in some cases especially, with salmon in the local area. I have explained to people in DFO that I no longer recognize that my kids will get the opportunity to fish here. I now work hard for my grandkids. The tears for my children's opportunity have long time dried. I know

that they will not get opportunity. We cannot fix this fast enough. It's impossible. All I can hope now is that by the time my kids have children, I'll be able to fish with those kids.

The lesson I have on my notes here is if you guys have not heard or have not yet been presented about the water sustainability fund, that is something that Spruce City Wildlife Association greatly supports as well. Thank you all for your time. I hope I stuck close to the five minutes.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Thank you, Dustin. Seven minutes, but, you know, I wanted to let you go because you were doing very well.  
Any questions for Dustin?

[1800]

**D. Clovechok:** Good to see you, Dustin. Thank you for your presentation. It's bang on, as far as I'm concerned, especially when it comes to ungulate management and wildlife management in general. I agree with you that increased fees.... As a hunter myself, I would be happy to pay that if those moneys went back into a fund that would be directly associated with.

FGS - 20190618 PM - Prince George 025/MBH/1800

It's bang on, as far as I'm concerned, especially when it comes to ungulate management and wildlife management in general.

I agree with you that increased fees.... As a hunter myself, I would be happy to pay that if those moneys went back into a fund that would be directly associated with wildlife management like the Freshwater Fisheries Society. So that's the model that exists today.

I'd be interested and curious in your opinion. Would you see a similar and a like organization, potentially, evolving around wildlife that would be like the Freshwater Fisheries Society outside of government that would be managing the wildlife, ungulates, grizzly bears and so on? I'm interested in your opinion on that, and if you think that would work.

**D. Snyder:** I believe so, and ideally, yes. The only concern that we really ran into, I believe, is how that integrates with forestry management as well. But right now, in talking with provincial moose biologists, even here in the local office, as soon as we switch to the conversation of habitat, she goes: "Whoa, whoa, whoa. That's not my.... I can't get involved in that." Because habitat is managed completely separately than wildlife.

Right now, our moose biologists are almost employed to count the moose. If those numbers keep going down, she just keeps counting smaller numbers. But ideally, yes, I believe that something like that can likely leverage more funds and potentially be, maybe, not more effective but be able to leverage funds better.

---

**D. Clovechok:** Your statements are completely correct. It's almost like a dog chasing its tail right now. It's been that way since the '50s so certainly, it's a non-partisan issue. No government since the '50s has put enough money into wildlife management, and it's time that we started to look at that so thank you very much.

**D. Ashton (Deputy Chair):** I just want to say thank you. I remember you from before — Justin Zimmer, if I remember his name correctly, from West Kelowna and Dave Brown from Penticton. It's people like you that are making a difference, and thank you.

One thing that you did touch on that's always been a pet peeve of many of us is the silos in all levels of government, not just provincial. That's something that if this committee can make a suggestion so we have that young lady doing a hell of a lot more than just counting moose.

Those are the things and trying to get these things combined, because like you said, we have a very limited amount of time to try and turn this around, otherwise it will be your great, great, grandkids that will have the issue. Thank you again for your interest in it.

**R. Leonard:** Very quickly. It can happen. I was in Vancouver in Still Creek. We were working to keep the last bit of it open and never expecting we would see salmon return, and 80 years later, they came in. Not 80 years since I started working there. So I'm really pleased that you have that hope. I just have a very simple question. The B.C. fish passage technical working group — who are they affiliated with? Who are they?

**D. Snyder:** That is kind of made up by the.... From my knowledge, there is forestry involvement there. There is B.C. engineers that are involved in that, as well as there's a water stewardship component that are kind of slightly involved.

Sean Wong, I believe is his name, and I believe he kind of heads up a good portion of that. He's involved with Ministry of Transportation, but that's kind of a side thing for him.

**R. Leonard:** So it's a provincial government technical working group across ministries?

**D. Snyder:** Yes, it's a provincial thing.

**R. Leonard:** Or Forestry?

**D. Snyder:** Yes, I believe it's across ministries.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Great. Well, thank you very much, Dustin. Appreciate it.

**B.C. WILDLIFE FEDERATION,**  
**REGION 7B PEACE-LIARD**

[0900]

**G. Paille:** I'm the regional president for the B.C. Wildlife Federation, and I'm also the chair of the B.C. Wildlife Federation's wildlife and allocation committee.

I think you've already heard from Al Martin and Chuck Zuckerman and maybe one other. I'm going to touch on a couple of big-picture items and then some more specific local issues

FGS - 20190619 AM - Fort St. John 013/shm/0900

allocation committee.

I think you've already heard from Al Martin and Chuck Zuckerman. There may be one other. I'm going to touch on a couple of big picture items and then some more specific local issues that we see.

We're still in a state where there is insufficient funding for fish and wildlife and habitat, big-time, especially when you compare it to other western jurisdictions. We heard from Virgil Moore, who has just retired as the director of fish and wildlife in Idaho, at our AGM, which, by coincidence, was held in Fort St. John this year. Their budget is \$120 million. Most of it comes from licensing fees and about 40 percent from federal excise taxes and, interestingly enough, none from general government taxes. In British Columbia, the director, in response to Virgil's remarks, said that she thinks it's about \$80 million.

In British Columbia, it's really, really hard to figure out how much money is being spent on fish, wildlife and habitat, because it's a multibranch and multiministry responsibility situation. Just this morning, I was looking at the budget documents from Idaho, and it's just laid out so nicely. We don't ever see any of that stuff from British Columbia.

In the run-up to the last election, all parties said they were going to dedicate all hunting fees to fish and wildlife management. It's never been done. Only the surcharges are dedicated, so there's about, probably, a \$8 million shortfall there of actual dedicated funds for wildlife management. Not to say that we're not spending more than that, but that makes it vulnerable, when the funds aren't dedicated.

We'd like to see all nature-based tourism operations contribute to the management of fish and wildlife. Right now it's mostly hunters and anglers that are paying the way. We hear that the bear tourism industry is voluntarily collecting money, but they're giving it to a private organization, not to government.

More and more, we're seeing stakeholders paying for what we see as core government responsibilities, like wildlife inventory and prescribed burns and things. We have local fundraisers, along with the Wild Sheep Society of B.C., and we're spending quite a bit of money towards those things. It just shouldn't happen. That's core government business.

To get on to local issues, Site C is a big one for us. The related compensation program — we have no idea how much money that is. The conditions under the water license say that Hydro gets to assess how well they're doing five years after the dam has been running and then ask for more money or say everything's good at that time. From



---

past experience with the other two dams, the compensation programs have been woefully underfunded, and they really have done nothing to replace things like moose. It was estimated that

the Williston impoundment area got rid of about 12,000 to 15,000 moose, and they've never returned. The compensation programs just haven't done it.

[0905]

We've got a huge issue with staffing up here — recruiting and maintaining staffing in the resource ministry. The executive director, a month ago, told me that they're short 17 positions — 17 vacancies now and five in fish and wildlife. I heard that our fisheries biologist just left when the COS opened up some more positions around the province. Guys bid out and went to other places. We had one CO in Fort St. John for a while until the new recruitment class graduated. So we need some incentives to get staffing up here and to keep them.

FGS - 20190619 AM - Fort St. John 014/lsh/0905

More positions around the province. Guys bid out and went to other places. So we had one CO in Fort St. John for awhile until the new recruitment class graduated. So we need some incentives to get staffing up here and to keep them.

The last thing I want to talk about is chronic wasting disease, which is particularly important for the East Kootenays and here in the Peace country because of our proximity to Alberta, where chronic wasting disease has been found. Recently, there have been two cases found in Libby, Montana, 50 kilometres from the border in the Kootenays.

We probably have it. So we're looking at scaling up surveillance in that area. There is no dedicated budget to a CWD program in British Columbia. They need freezers. They need money to do testing of the samples. The program just is not being funded at all right now. It's being done off the side of somebody's desk.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Okay. Thank you very much.

**R. Coleman:** Gerry, I've sat through a lot of things on fish and wildlife over the years. First time — could you tell me what chronic wasting disease is?

**G. Paille:** It's a prion disease. So it's a malformed protein. It's related to mad cow disease and — I think it's called — Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease in humans. It's never been shown to yet transfer to humans, but in areas like Saskatchewan and southeastern Alberta it's highly prevalent. It just makes the deer sick, and they die. It's 100 percent fatal.

**R. Coleman:** Is it prevalent in wildlife or does it go across to the domestic animal?

**G. Paille:** Totally. No, it's cervids, and it arrived in Saskatchewan through farmed elk that came from North Dakota and then spread, kind of like wildlife, from there. They're going to scale up their surveillance program in the east Kootenays — maybe make it mandatory to turn in heads.

We don't have the money to deal with it, if there is actually a positive case in B.C. New York spent \$2 million on sharpshooters, helicopters, hunters, essentially depopulating in a ten-mile radius around the positive tests there. So we need to be prepared to deal with this. And we need money to do it. It's not in the budget right now.

**R. Coleman:** I just wondered: have we had a case yet in B.C.?

**G. Paille:** We have had no confirmed cases, with around 6,000 samples from the east Kootenays and maybe 1,000 from here over the last ten years or so.

**R. Coleman:** Great. Thank you.

**N. Simons:** Thank you. The Idaho licensing fees — do you happen to know if they're higher than they are here?

**G. Paille:** They're a little bit higher, but in the same range. We've been advocating for government to do a survey of hunters and anglers to see what they might stand in terms of increases to license fees. But at the same time, we don't think hunters and anglers are the only users of wildlife in the province, and other users need to be contributing as well.

**N. Simons:** Gerry, besides the bear viewers, who would you include in that list of other contributors?

**G. Paille:** Snowmobilers, backpackers, birdwatchers — any organization that's going out on the landscape and basing their businesses on wildlife and habitat.

**N. Simons:** Just a final comment. Do you know if other jurisdictions use fines towards the cost of conservation, as we do in B.C.?

**G. Paille:** They do in Idaho. And yes. So sometimes judges, on wildlife offences, will rule that the money goes into the Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation.

**N. Simons:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

**D. Clovechok:** Thank you, Gerry, for your presentation. I couldn't agree with you more, especially in the Kootenays, that CWD is a huge issue and needs some money put behind it.

[0910]

I just want to talk a little bit about the funding model, and I couldn't agree with you more. It's certainly a non-partisan issue because we haven't funded wildlife in this province since the '50s. It's chronic, and it needs to be addressed. I'd just be really interested.... And I don't know if you were in, prior to the last election, the meeting in Cranbrook that had

FGS - 20190619 AM - Fort St. John 015/bmg/0910

---

talk a little bit about the funding model, and I couldn't agree with you more. It's certainly a non-partisan issue, because we haven't funded wildlife in this province since the '50s. It's chronic, and it needs to be addressed.

I'd just be really interested.... I don't know if you were, prior to the last election, at the meeting in Cranbrook that had.... It was an all-party, all-people meeting. We talked about this and the development of a.... Call it a

society, for lack of a better word, similar to the Freshwater Fisheries Society, where you create a model where wildlife management is taken away and out of the hands of government and put into an organization that could be directly funded through and with government money. But it also opens up to philanthropic money, as well, and corporate money that could be directed towards it.

I'd like to know what your opinion would be on the creation of a model like the Freshwater Fisheries Society around wildlife management.

**G. Paille:** We're not 100 percent happy with the Freshwater Fisheries Society but absolutely support some kind of model like that. I'm thinking you heard Jesse Zeman.

**D. Clovechok:** I did so.

**G. Paille:** Jesse speaks very well about this. Yeah, we're a proponent of moving the money out of government with some government oversight, and we think that we can leverage more funds, like you were saying, from philanthropic organizations if the money is separate from government, because people are reluctant to give whole piles of money to government not being sure as to how it's going to be spent.

**R. Leonard:** Since you brought it up.... Thank you very much for your presentation. I really appreciate it. It gives a really good overview of what you're dealing with.

You say you're not entirely happy with the Freshwater Fisheries Society. What kinds of issues are there?

**G. Paille:** Well, they don't spend any money up here for one thing.

**R. Leonard:** Okay. So this is an issue around accountability, right? You're giving money, but you're not getting anything in return, and you have no way of forcing that.

**G. Paille:** Yeah — and the same thing with the fish and wildlife compensation program from B.C. Hydro. We have an issue with that too — big time.

**D. Ashton (Deputy Chair):** Thank you for your presentation. I don't think it's accountability. It's use in areas where the disbursements take place. That, again, is that the government has issues with silos, and there are issues with silos that have to be addressed in regards to fisheries and wildlife habitat. We've all got to work together on this. That's the only way we're going to get to the bottom and make it fixed. So drop the silos, and let's see if we can make a big difference for the province.

Having gone to school in the United States, specifically Washington state, and the amount of money that gets poured into wildlife and fisheries rehabilitation, we've got a long way to go.

**G. Paille:** We've heard, I think, Jesse's presentation. We've heard that Bonneville Power puts something like \$300 million annually into fish and wildlife management. It's incredible amounts of money.

We're also advocates for a federal excise tax. It's not a British Columbia solution, but in the States, they have two acts where there is an excise tax on firearms, ammunition and fishing lures, and the states apply for that money to come back. So, in Idaho, they get something like \$50 million annually from that tax.

Our retailers in British Columbia can't stand to have a B.C.-only solution, especially here. Going to Grande Prairie is pretty easy, and with the Internet shopping, you could avoid that tax pretty easily if the option was there.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Right.

**G. Paille:** I'd advocate for the provincial government to work with the feds to try and get something going in that area.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Thank you very much, Gerry. We appreciate it.



**B.C. WILDLIFE FEDERATION,  
REGION 5**

**K. Last:** My name is Ken Last. I'm the president of region 5 of BCWF, which is the Cariboo.

First of all, I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to address the Standing Committee on Finance and Government Services. My members hope you appreciate the merits of their concerns.

The British Columbia Wildlife Federation is the oldest conservation organization, with approximately 45,000 members province-wide. We believe in science-based decision-making as a key tool to manage our resources. We wish to point out the wildlife resource, including fish, as an integral part of the lifestyle for many residents. There are families that strictly rely on fish and wildlife for food, and this is a long-standing tradition.

This was recognized as a principal for discussion in the region 5 round table on moose. In the Cariboo region, many residents feel the province is managing fish and wildlife populations to zero.

Examples. The mountain caribou population in the Itcha Ilgachuz have declined from a population of 2,800 animals to a current population of 640. The Cariboo-Chilcotin moose populations have declined by an estimated 50 to 70 percent in the same time period.

Mule deer populations are declining. Resident hunters saw reduction in the bag limit of two bucks to a one-buck limit, along with a reduction in the provincial mule deer bag limits. There is also a corresponding reduction in limited-entry permits for antlerless mule deer, due to low populations.

The loss of wild sheep harvesting opportunities for several herds in management unit 5 [inaudible recording] returned to spawn from historic levels of 3,000 to 4,000 fish, despite concerns being raised by First Nations and resident anglers.

Recently, I participated in the Cariboo moose solutions round table, hosted by the Tsilhqot'in First Nation and the provincial government. The following is from the facilitators of the meeting. In the three recommendations, one was

"to plan and undertake access management, especially for non-status roads, combined with forest licensing, road deactivation and habitat restoration; develop a multifaceted and integrated approach to understanding and addressing predator impacts on prey, while also improving the habitat — there is a strong desire for timely action on reducing impacts from predators; and enhance population assessment methods to include Indigenous and local data sources and develop a common and accessible information platform to inform decisions."

---

These three recommendations were endorsed by all attendees. To date, no action has been taken on the recommendations. Several of these recommendations are part of wildlife management. The province needs to step up to the plate. First Nations' frustration in a lack of wildlife management is evident by blockades and other civil disobedience because of declining wildlife population.

The fact remains that if we grow moose and other wildlife populations, then the conflict between stakeholders should disappear. A key component in the current state of wildlife management in region 5 is the need for sufficient and sustainable funding for wildlife management over time. There needs to be consistent and adequate funding provided. British Columbia needs to have dedicated funding for wildlife management.

Other jurisdictions have all implemented dedicated funding, and our province is falling behind. An example to consider is the state of Alaska, which recognized the needs of residents to access wildlife for food. The Alaska state subsistence act provides for their resident needs. It provides for reasonable funding and recognizes and guarantees the right of all Alaskans to hunt, fish and forage for food.

[1620]

Wildlife in British Columbia belongs to all the residents of the province, and the provincial government has an obligation to provide fish and wildlife for all residents to use. My members feel that the province has forgotten that many residents harvest wildlife to feed their families. It is imperative that data be collected on both ungulates and predators to make well-informed decisions and management plans for all species. There must be an effort to monitor the impacts on the land base from development. The lack of investment in our wildlife resource

FGS - 20190619 PM - Quesnel 005/lrm/1620

any residents harvest wildlife to feed their families. It is apparent that that data be collected on both ungulates and predators to make well-informed decisions and management plans for all species. There must be an effort to monitor the impacts on the land base from development. The lack of investment in our wildlife resource has led to the current state, where wildlife has been negatively impacted through all regions.

Lack of dedicated sufficient funding for fish and wildlife management has got this into the above situation. Please review *Trends in Renewable Resource Management in B.C.*, 2014 — Archibald, Eastman and Nyberg. The document is still relevant.

British Columbia has gone from the best-managed wildlife jurisdiction in Canada to one of the poorest. The solution is simple for Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents. There needs to be real investment in wildlife management for our great province. Our residents are concerned that if changes are not made to wildlife management, the federal government will assume jurisdiction

---

and direct management of wildlife under the provisions of the Species at Risk Act, such as they have threatened to do with the mountain caribou.

I have some recommendations. To help reverse the current declines in wildlife, a provincial wildlife committee be established from all stakeholders to provide advice to the minister responsible for wildlife policy issues and on expenses from a dedicated fund. This should be a permanent wildlife management fund established to support wildlife management activities by the province, the private sector and First Nations.

My members feel that it's essential to have the following three principles apply to a wildlife management fund. Those who actually contribute funds should have a say in how the funds are allocated and should receive clear information on how these funds are spent.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** You're at about six minutes now.

I just want to say, with the committee: do you mind if Ken just keeps going? I'm just worried that we won't have any question time. We're okay?

Just keep going, Ken.

**K. Last:** I'm just about done.

The allocating funds must be transparent, accountable and will be subject to freedom of information requests. First Nations must be included in the allocations in their role as wildlife and habitat managers. Currently 100 percent of freshwater fishing fees are dedicated and divided between Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation and the freshwater fisheries of British Columbia, whereas only a very small portion of hunting licence fees and limited entry applications are allocated to the Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation.

We propose that all hunting licence fees, species authorization tags and limited application fees be dedicated to fund wildlife management. Anglers and hunters also contribute to the regional and provincial economy by purchasing boats, vehicles, motel stays, food, fuel and hunting gear. We do not believe the province recognizes these expenditures or connects them to hunting and fishing activities.

The continued decline in opportunities has a direct impact on the economics of the province in the Cariboo region, where my members reside. There needs to be an overview process for resource extraction and the impacts of such activities on fish and wildlife be considered before extraction permits are granted. There should be a follow-up at the completion.

I have directed my remarks primarily to the Cariboo-Chilcotin region and the situation as it currently exists. My membership is frustrated and concerned, as are Indigenous people, due to the lack of wildlife management. It is plain that the province wants healthy, expanded fish and wildlife

---

populations. More funding is required, since fish and wildlife funding has lagged behind all other provincial ministries for many years.

Please remember that both Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities rely on these natural resources. I've listed the references.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Thanks so much, Ken.

We only have a couple of minutes for questions.

**N. Simons:** I just want to thank you for your presentation, and your colleagues throughout the province who have done a really good job of expressing the urgency of this issue. The fact is that it's not a new issue but one that's obviously current and needs to be addressed. So I thank you very much for making a good case for improved funding.

We've heard about options of licence fees being directed or increased.... There have been all sorts of options being put forward, but the issue is clear.

**D. Clovechok:** Thank you, Ken, for your presentation. It's an important one. One of the things that I personally found is that this is the first time that we've heard this at this table is how important harvesting of wildlife is for feeding families and how many families depend, not only in your region but in mine, in the Kootenays, depend on taking an animal to feed their family over the winter. So that's a very important point that you make there.

[1625]

You talked about the tags and everything going into a body. Can you just really quickly maybe give me a vision of what that management structure would look like?

**K. Last:** Well, it would be mostly stakeholders. It could operate under the Societies Act, similar to the

FGS - 20190619 PM - Quesnel 006/bmg/1625

that you make there. You talked about the tags and everything going into a body. Can you just really quickly maybe give me a vision of what that management structure would look like?

**K. Last:** Well, it would be mostly stakeholders. It could operate under the Societies Act, similar to the Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation.

**D. Clovechok:** Thank you.

**B. D'Eith (Chair):** Great. Thank you very much, Ken. We really appreciate it