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Abstract

Citizen activists from all walks of life increasingly face the decision of whether or not to participate in multi-stakeholder, consensus negotiations to resolve environmental and other disputes. While this thesis studies one such consensus forum - the Vancouver Island Commission on Resources and the Environment (CORE) process - the analysis has implications beyond the land-use debate.

This study analyzes CORE as a particular example of consensus negotiations and arrives at conclusions critical of the efficacy of CORE and other such fora. As a government-instituted, formally facilitated process, CORE did little to encourage substantive debate about serious land-use problems. Nor did it resolve any of the contentious issues facing the province. Rather, it served to contain debate and keep it out of the public domain.

The underlying assumption of CORE that consensus could be possible among participants who have fundamentally different values and goals is critically evaluated. Consensus is possible where there is common ground and goals but not in a multi-stakeholder forum such as CORE where participants hold different world outlooks and purposes. In such a forum a negotiation is possible but not a consensus. Therefore, people choosing to participate in multi-stakeholder fora should be prepared to engage in strategic negotiations.

The “level playing field” mythology of a round table forum is explored; the notion that participants are equal denies the significant differences in authority, financial resources and negotiating skills they command. Participants who
assume they are participating as equals are not critically evaluating their own strengths and weaknesses and thereby lose some of their effectiveness.

The conclusion of the thesis is that citizens can have a greater chance of affecting political change through public education, media work and direct government lobbying than they can through participation in government sponsored multi-stakeholder fora.

This was a participant-observer study in which the author participated directly in CORE as a Fishery sector representative. Further data was gathered through interviews with representatives from each sector and by analyzing written materials produced by government and non-governmental sources.
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Chapter One

Consensus negotiation: Common ground or strategic bargaining: - A case study

The political background

In British Columbia's history as a province, development has been largely dependent on the exploitation of natural resources, especially logging, mining and fishing. By the 1970s, British Columbians started to become aware that the amount of timber being harvested was no longer biologically sustainable. This perception was officially recognized by the provincial government's Royal Commission on Forest Resources (Pearse 1976). Problems associated with logging included loss of old-growth ecosystems, fish habitat destroyed through landslides and siltation, as well as timber overcutting. Government management of forestry practices through the Coastal Fisheries Forestry Guidelines were seen as ineffective in protecting resource values such as fisheries and recreation but rather in supporting the economic goals of large, integrated forest companies (Pinkerton 34).

Since the political and bureaucratic authorities were not seen by many members of an increasingly activist public to be protecting forest ecosystems, many individuals and groups demonstrated their opposition through new forms of
political expression. These included mass demonstrations and protests, tree
climbing to prevent logging, and blockades of public or logging roads. By the late
1980s, the level of conflict and acrimony around forest practices had escalated
to such an extent that many were calling it the “war in the woods”.

The government needed to find a way of responding to and handling this
conflict. Meanwhile, across the border in the United States, governments at the
state and local levels had been using various conflict resolution models involving
alternate dispute resolution and mediation with some success. In the 1990s, the
British Columbia government decided to develop shared decision-making forums
as a way of dealing with forestry confrontations, and it established the
Commission on Resources and the Environment (CORE), a multistakeholder
dispute resolution process, to deal with land use conflicts.

Further, on a day-to-day operational level, the government officials needed to
find different, non-hierarchical ways of making land-use decisions. Long-term,
strategic land-use planning was now demanded by a newly aware and
concerned citizenry, which felt it had a right to have a say in publicly-owned land
and resource use. Traditional “top-down” decision-making, in which government
and industry representatives made decisions behind closed doors, was no longer
acceptable. In 1990, the Social Credit government under Bill VanderZalm,
established the British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and the
Economy as a multistakeholder forum to map out a route to planning for
sustainability. In its publication, Public Involvement in Government Decision-
Making: Choosing the Right Model, “it declared that governments have been
facing increasing pressure to involve the public in their decision-making” (1994 3). The document went on to explain that this change had come about because of a more informed public and a greater variety of values being expressed. The document further argued “there is a mistrust of traditional ‘closed door’ decision-making and of the ability of governments and their experts to take all major factors into account. Traditional methods of informing or consulting with the public suffer a lack of credibility” (3).

After the New Democratic Party under Mike Harcourt took over government in 1991, it put the Round Table’s advice into practice by establishing the Commission of Resources and the Environment (CORE) led by Commissioner Stephen Owen, the province’s former Ombudsman. The public saw in CORE a way to cut through the confrontation and discord. One independent forester and journalist, Bob Nixon, legislative reporter on resource issues and editor of Forest Planning Canada, said that the task facing CORE “according to [British Columbia] Premier Harcourt, is to put an end to the escalating conflict and controversy in our forests” (Nixon 12 Feb. 93).

In 1990, I began working on land-use issues¹ and was optimistic that the dispute-resolution models from the American experience would help resolve the land-use conflicts in B.C. There was hope among non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that they would be empowered by the “even-playing-field-consensus” style of negotiation offered by the Round Table. The driving principle of Round Table negotiation is that there is no hierarchical structure where one participant sits at the head of the table; rather, all participants sit at the table as
equals. The seminal Round Table document on consensus, Reaching Agreement, highlighted the importance of equal opportunities for participants through a "level playing field in terms of their ability to participate in a meaningful way, equal access to information and to the ultimate decision-makers, [and]...alleviating financial hardship" (British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and the Economy Reaching Agreement 17). The Harcourt government's approach to the forest debate would emphasize participant equality. This, he said "implies a community-centered focus which emphasizes equality of opportunity, meaningful public participation and localized decision-making" (quoted in Nixon 22 Feb. 1993).

The promise of meaningful participation was offered to NGOs. I had both an academic and a work-related interest in analyzing what actually occurs and what can be achieved in round table negotiations. In my work life, I am director of the T. "Buck" Suzuki Environmental Foundation, an organization which undertakes environmental work related to fish habitat and water quality. The foundation works closely with the commercial fishing community, particularly with members of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union (UFAWU). As part of my assigned work, I participated in the Fishery sector of the Vancouver Island CORE process which was mandated in 1992 by the Commission on Resources and the Environment for the Vancouver Island region. Therefore, this study involves considerable participant observation as well as formal interviews outside of the actual CORE meetings of CORE participants. Through my academic work, I wanted to analyze to what extent the stated intention of "empowerment" - that
is, granting authority and equal power to participants who in reality were not equal, in terms of financial resources, education, public influence, formal position, social class, control of land and control of production - would be realized. I wanted to critically examine whether there could be "shared decision-making" given the objective power imbalances among participants.

On the one hand, there were the forest companies with their legally entrenched rights to the land; on the other hand, there were interest groups with virtually no power base from which to affect the process. I wanted to examine this model of multi-stakeholder consensus negotiation which involved both types of groups who were seen to have a legitimate interest or stake in the issue. Could multi-stakeholder consensus negotiations really bring all interests together and encourage them to engage in rigorous, substantive debate about their differences? Or would the fact that the government had initiated and structured CORE serve to contain debate and keep the conflict out of the media? The interest-based stakeholder model also meant that the public-at-large (the non-affiliated individuals who were not formally associated with interest groups) was excluded from the discussions. I wanted to analyze what that meant in terms of the claim that this model provided a more inclusive forum.

I also wanted to examine the intentions of participants and their stated and unstated goals. One particular question was whether some engaged in CORE with the intentions of gaining greater understanding and finding common ground, while others participated only to achieve strategically pre-determined goals. How
would consensus negotiations be affected when participants with different intentions took part?

Participants also expressed different value systems and world outlooks, and I wanted to discover if consensus was possible among people with such different perspectives. I also wanted to assess whether a consensus-based round table process could contribute positively to a shift in values as a result of contact between groups who wouldn't normally have contact with one another.

Finally, I had a pragmatic reason for undertaking this study which was to assess whether environmental organizations should participate in round table consensus forums or whether they should concentrate their efforts instead in other arenas, such as grassroots organizing, direct political lobbying, education, and media campaigns. Which approach would be more beneficial to groups like the T. "Puck" Suzuki Environmental Foundation?

The announcement of CORE

In the beautiful setting of Pearson College outside of Victoria in February 1992, the year-old NDP government led by Premier Harcourt announced it was setting up CORE, a new way to make land-use decisions. The announcement was a public spectacle - the first of a series of forestry-related press conferences with tree-value "optics". Commissioner Stephen Owen was presented to the assembled audience of formally invited guests, including myself. It was proclaimed that CORE would be independent from the government and would
develop an overall land and resource-use strategy for British Columbia. It would make recommendations to Cabinet on legislation, policies and practices to resolve long-standing land-use conflicts. CORE would incorporate public participation in decision making as an alternative to “top-down” government control. CORE was contextualized within a larger framework of environmental, economic and social sustainability and seemed to fit the values and goals of a social democratic government.

The government press spectacle that introduced CORE dealt exclusively with the “war in the woods” and the need to preserve old growth forests. It did not address the land-use concerns of the fishing community, which include small salmon-spawning and rearing streams as well as estuary marshes and wetlands. At the press conference, the UFAWU pointed out that protecting fish streams from destructive logging practices could not be accommodated by looking only at large protected areas.

We were also informed at the press conference that a significant feature of CORE would be interest-based representation and agreement through consensus (which is defined in the CORE Orientation Materials as “literally, ‘feeling together’, the process of coming to a communally acceptable agreement through group participation in formulating the outcome” (British Columbia CORE Orientation Materials 40). It sounded very democratic but also very labour intensive; someone from the fishing community would have to participate in a full year’s worth of meetings. There would also be expenses associated with sending a representative to the meetings. We were reassured by Commissioner Owen
and forest minister Dan Miller that appropriate participant funding would be available to create a level playing field for all.

Our organization was certainly not alone in expressing the concern about intervener funding. For example, the Carmanah Forestry Society put forward this basic requirement for their participation in CORE: "That adequate funding for E-CORE [the environmental constituency] from CORE funds be granted to achieve parity with resource extraction interests for co-ordination, negotiations, technical support and communication for our constituency" (Watershed Sentinel December/January 1992/1993).

Between February and October 1992, Commissioner Owen hired twenty staff, some of whom were assigned to draft a set of principles which covered planning and participation in CORE. The staff decided that there would be a province-wide CORE table as well as regional tables. The participatory process would involve the development of both a regional planning process and a dispute-resolution system. The regional tables were given some latitude in the recommendations they could make, depending on the needs and activities of their region. However, each regional plan would have to conform to province-wide principles of sustainability (contained in The Land-use Charter drafted by CORE staff during the process) and conform to one of the following land-use designations: protected, special management, integrated resource or intensive use (British Columbia CORE CORE Regional Planning Guidelines: Making Regional Land-use Decisions Within a Shared Decision-Making Context 14 Jan. 93. 3). The
CORE staff further determined that participation would be through a mediated, multi-sectoral, interest-based consensus negotiation.

**The structure of the Vancouver Island CORE table**

The Vancouver Island CORE table was structured by sectors; that is, each seat at the table was allocated to a major stakeholder or government group which had an interest in the outcome of land allocation decisions. The sectors were not necessarily pre-existing groups; in many cases they consisted of organizations that had never worked together before. Nor did they represent purely geographical areas. The prime criteria for selecting representatives of different sectors were "effectiveness" and "inclusivity" (British Columbia CORE Orientation Materials 10). At the outset, CORE staff argued that too many groups or individuals sitting at the table would make it ineffective, yet all major interests had to be represented. CORE guidelines stated that "participant groups should structure themselves so as to have a broadly representative voice, effectively including every element of their constituency" (British Columbia CORE Regional Planning Guidelines 14 Jan 93 3). The process by which each sector gained a seat at the table was neither clear nor consistent. Some groups were invited by CORE staff to form a sector while other sectors with less clearly defined constituents took longer to organize themselves and gain a seat at the table. The sectors that ended up at the CORE table were: Agriculture, Conservation, Forest Employment, Forest Independents, Forest Managers and Manufacturers,
Fishery, General Employment, Local Government, Mining, Outdoor Recreation, Provincial Government, Social and Economic Sustainability, Tourism, and Youth. That the Provincial Government was to constitute a sector was pre-determined by the CORE staff. This representative was Murray Rankin, a lawyer on contract to cabinet to attend CORE meetings and report to cabinet. He was the only spokesperson for the government at the table, although he would consult with technical staff from the ministries of the Environment, Forestry and Municipal Affairs. This was a unique sector inasmuch as Rankin was representing the provincial government's interests at the table; at the same time he was reporting to the politicians who would make decisions based on the outcome of the negotiations.

Further, there were a number of sensitive issues which the commissioner and CORE staff announced were to be excluded from the agenda. These topics included clear-cutting logging practices and multi-national forest company land tenures on Crown land. Also, some geographical areas within the regional boundaries were arbitrarily excluded by commission staff: north and south Gulf islands, south and mid-coast forest districts and Clayoquot Sound.

After nearly a year of two-to-three-day-long monthly meetings, the Vancouver Island CORE process was completed. Unfortunately, by November 23, 1993, when the government-determined time limit expired, the table had not reached consensus on many issues. Why did some important goals of CORE remain unmet?
Alternate dispute resolution

A survey of the literature on alternate dispute resolution will serve as a backdrop to assess CORE.

Alternate dispute resolution (ADR) is not a panacea for resolving difficult land use issues, but it has worked in many situations. Lawrence Susskind enumerates four criteria - “fair, efficient, wise and stable” (in Bowering 5) - that should be applied in judging the success of ADR. Both Susskind and Gerald Cormick explain that at the conclusion of a successful process all parties should feel they were treated fairly (Cormick 1987 41, Susskind in Bowering 5). Second, the process should seem efficient both in terms of saving time and money as well as insuring that potential advantages to all participants were not left unclaimed. Third, the agreement reached should be stable, and finally there should be a “wise design, a wise development package” which means when we look back on the process in the future we would consider it to be a good one (Susskind in Bowering 5).

However, there are also situations in which ADR is difficult to apply. An important caveat to the use of ADR in BC is to recognize that most disputes are played out on crown land. And as Thomas Gunton and Sarah Flynn point out:

The application of ADR to crown land is particularly challenging. Crown land planning often involves many parties, the issues are poorly defined, there is often an incentive for some parties to avoid a decision in order to maintain the status quo and there are often fundamental value differences (15).
To be successful, then, ADR must meet a number of criteria. Four themes predominate in the literature.

**The process must be designed by the participants**

A point frequently reiterated in the literature is that the process must be designed by the participants. Both the BC Round Table on the Environment and Economy and the National Round Table make the point that “it is critical that all parties have an equal opportunity to participate in designing the process” (National Round Table on the Environment and Economy NRTEE 8). This should include developing a “structure for how the process will work, including meeting formats, working sub-groups, caucuses, and groundrules” (NRTEE 14). Susskind agrees that the process should be “ad hoc [by] which we mean there should be room in each situation for the participants to design the dispute resolution process they prefer” (1987 77). And Cormick adds that “generally, if those who are expected to use a dispute settlement process do not see the need for such a mechanism or are not involved in its design and implementation, it is unlikely to work ... Evidence suggests that the least promising way to develop a system is to import it from elsewhere” (1987 41).
The agenda must be determined by the participants

In addition to participants designing the structure of the process, they must also generate the agenda in order to feel that they have been treated fairly and in order to have a stable agreement at the conclusion of the process. If an agenda has been pre-determined, Douglas Amy cautions that the process may be used to legitimize and implement policies and decisions which have been made elsewhere. He points to a U.S. government report which encouraged federal officials to use “conflict management tools like conciliation, facilitation and mediation...to avoid regulatory stand-offs and move opponents to mutually acceptable settlements” (Amy 151). This report raises the possibility that an ADR can be used as a management tool rather than as a participant-run process:

[Conflict management] should not be confused with requirement for public participation. The key word is management. In cases where public groups are fighting with the Federal government, better conflict management means better control over the participation process... At the outset, the mediator requires the agency to outline its specific constraints - regulatory, political, economic - under which it must operate and within which any final agreement must fall (151 & 152).

By setting the parameters of what can be discussed, the process managers have determined what is negotiable. “In essence, the government controls the agenda of the negotiations and predetermines the outcome. In practice this means that although an agency may be willing to grant concessions on details, the basic policy decisions remain nonnegotiable” (Amy 152). Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz call this process “nondecisionmaking” which they define as “the practice
of limiting the scope of actual decisionmaking to 'safe issues” (in Amy 153). By limiting the agenda to “safe issues”, the process managers ensure that fundamental value and policy issues are not discussed even if the participants want such issues to be discussed. This narrowing of the issues leads to both an unfair and an unstable outcome.

**Participation: Inclusive or restricted?**

Opinion is divided on whether ADR should be inclusive or involve only those with certain kinds of power. Those in the former camp include Cormick, Susskind and the National Roundtable, which says that a guiding principle of consensus processes is that they must be “inclusive not exclusive. All parties with a significant interest in the issue should be involved” (Doering 2). The Environment Canada document, *Working in Multistakeholder Processes* goes further to ensure broad public participation:

> Invitations can be sent directly to all known interests asking them to attend and pass on the invitation [to the first meeting] to others. Media such as radio and local television can be used to publicize the meeting. Newspaper advertisements should be run...posters distributed to public areas such as libraries, schools... or an invitation sent to every household using a flyer delivery service... (Canada 53).

On the other hand, some ADR students recommend that only stakeholders who have power or influence to undermine or subvert any decision which might be made, should be included (British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and Economy 22, Flynn 31). Mediator Harold Bellman determines participants’
access to a dispute resolution process based on how much power they have
outside of the process:

One of the reasons that mediation works is that it is usually limited to
people that have some impact on the situation. I don’t ask people who
don’t have clout to participate in the mediation. This is not public
participation, this is cloutful people’s participation. That’s a real important
difference. I don’t have anything to do with people without power because
they can’t affect what I’m doing (Bellman in Amy 134).

If the process managers adopt an inclusive approach to participant
involvement there is a greater chance that the public - non affiliated individuals
who do have a generalized interest in the dispute - will have input into the
decision. However, given that ADR usually relies on stakeholder interest groups,
there is a weakness in involving the public. The outcome may result in a decision
which is neither fair, efficient nor wise. It may be good for the stakeholders but
not necessarily for the public interest (Gunton and Flynn 15). As Amy points out
there is little room for any notion of the public interest in the mediation
process. A good mediated agreement is almost always defined as one
that satisfies those parties in the negotiations - with little reference to any
outside public interest... The problem, of course, is that equating the
bargainers’ interests with the public interest is quite questionable -
especially when significant parts of the public are left out of the bargaining
process (139).

Whether the process is formulated on an inclusive or power-broker model, the
issue of equality among the participants is still central to an effective and
successful program.
**Funding and other resources must be provided to participants**

One of the inevitable inequalities among participants will be the differences in financial resources available to industry and to NGOs. Both the BC and National round tables state that participant funding must be provided to stakeholders who need it. As Craig Darling commented about financial resources in the Clayoquot Sound Sustainable Development Task Force, “without such financial assistance, the volunteers (whose involvement was critical to the outcome of the process) were constrained from effective and sustained participation. Funding assistance would also have served to help “level the playing field” and address power imbalances” (Darling 38). The public at large, as well as certain interests groups, will be disadvantaged in a process such as CORE because of unequal financial resources. Kim Brenneis and Michael M’Gonigle point out that, “the general public lacks sufficient resources to participate on an equal basis with affected business interests, necessitating the provision of intervener funding as a prerequisite to equitable participation in the evaluation of a complex problem” (9).

There will also be disparities in other resources including time, numbers of people involved, friendships and professional relationships, legal rights, access to politicians and bureaucrats, knowledge, negotiating experience and skills and political power (Gunton and Flynn 1992, Wilson 1995, Wondolleck 1988, Cormick 1986). Susskind considers the imbalances in knowledge and skill to be more problematic than imbalances in political power - the influence and power an individual or group holds outside the process. He suggests that with regard to the
power imbalance that political alliances within the negotiation process can benefit weaker groups thus leveling the disparity in power:

Negotiation is not an antidote to inequality. Groups can be, and sometimes are, outnumbered or outmaneuvered... On the other hand, we maintain that power in negotiating is dynamic, and that political power away from the bargaining table is not necessarily a good predictor of what will happen once negotiations begin. Coalitions can form, tipping the scales in unexpected ways (135).

On the other hand, writers such as David Cohen, caution that mediation may be inappropriate “where there is an incorrectable power imbalance” (Cohen in Lane 203).

Another need for a power balance in a negotiation is so that the disputants will participate voluntarily. As Amy points out, “in environmental mediation, the question of voluntariness is a crucial one” (146) and “one of the few institutional safeguards that help to ensure the fairness of the process” (147). If groups join the process because they feel they really don’t have any other options, then not only will the result not be fair and stable, but the negotiations could be distorted because they are not undertaken in good faith. As Darling points out:

The process must allow the parties to discuss first with their constituents and then with each other the purpose and desirability of negotiation, their willingness to process and the need to involve a mediator. This is fundamental. One of the reasons these processes have failed in the past is that we have forced parties to participate, then we find that they are unable to actually join in a consensus later on (Darling in Roseland 32).

More importantly is the dynamic that equal power will provide the motivation to come to the negotiating table. If, through using their equal power outside the process, the parties have become locked into a stalemate where each can
stymie the other from achieving its goals, then ADR becomes an attractive possibility (BC Roundtable 1991, National Round Table 1993, Flynn 1992).

However, for participants with unequal power, the pressures to participate are often subtle. When a process is mandated by government, participants may feel that their lack of participation could disadvantage them in future policy decisions, or that they will lose public credibility. As Amy says “outside political pressure can often make it difficult for environmentalists to oppose a mediation effort even when they believe it may be a waste of time” and “that the political pressure to be reasonable can induce environmentalists to stick with a mediation effort even when it is not working” (177). Gunton and Flynn point out that “successful ADR therefore requires an equitable distribution of power, an assumption rarely validated” (15).

Why would a group with more power than the others invest its time and energy in the negotiations? Amy suggests that they might engage in mediation even when they had alternatives because through mediation their objectives “would be granted a degree of political legitimacy that would be hard to obtain otherwise” (149).

**Finding common ground, compromise and consensus**

Even if the criteria mentioned in the literature are met, there is still a fundamental issue to address. One of the tenets of ADR is that there are no right or wrong positions. As Lane points out “it is critically important that the mediator
refrain from judging the legitimacy of points raised by the parties" (201). Framing environmental disputes, for example, as amoral interest conflicts allows the negotiating forum to accommodate as many interests as possible in reaching a compromise. As one writer explains:

The mediator’s job is to get negotiators to doubt perceptions that block agreement. Those perceptions might be a view of an issue, an understanding of the impact of a proposal, a problem definition, an assumption, or a value... In this sense environmental mediation is not simply a way of resolving environmental conflicts, it is also a way of redefining the way we think about them (Thomas Colosi in Amy 163 & 164).

In other words, ADR can work best, at least in environmental conflicts, when ethics and values are parked at the door. However, this ignores the reality that participants may hold fundamentally different values. True, there are situations where there is a commonality of outlook. Jerold Auerbach notes much of the historical support for consensual dispute resolution has come from tightly-knit groups with communitarian values such as Quakers and Puritans. These groups shared values and goals and “the framework for resolving disagreements was mutual and consensual, not adversarial” (Auerbach in Amy 83). Yet, as Bellman points out, “environmental mediation is not an encounter session but an intensely adversarial and combative process, where each side tries to get the most for itself and only compromises when it is forced to” (Bellman in Amy 86).

While there is the notion in ADR that all parties' views are equally valid, there is general recognition among the writers that there cannot be a negotiated agreement where fundamental value differences are at stake (Wondolleck,
Susskind 1987, Amy). As a result, Susskind argues, ADR should be "restricted to distributional issues (not fundamental value questions, or issues of basic human rights)" (1987 77). However, since in many environmental conflicts, the dispute is not over a single issue or principle but rather "disagreement over world views" (Amy 184), this raises the issue of whether ADR is appropriate for settling such disputes. Connick does acknowledge that basic conflicts of interest are inevitably part of a mediation, but he concludes that "mediation is best seen as a process for settling disputes, not resolving them" (Connick in Amy 173). On the other hand, Amy concludes "that you can't have consensus among people with different world views" (184).

So if consensus is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve among participants with different value systems, what are the consequences for those with less bargaining clout? One writer says, "the claim that people have common interests can be a way of misleading the less powerful into collaborating with the more powerful in schemes that benefit the latter" (Mansbridge in Amy 171). And another writer cautions:

the only viable solution to the problems caused by power inequities is the establishment of more equal distribution of political and economic power between disputants in environmental controversies. In the meantime, however, the only short-term safeguard against the problems of power in environmental mediation is a growing public awareness of their existence (Amy 162).

It is against the issues and criteria discussed in this literature review that CORE will be assessed.
Theoretical background

Clearly ADR theory and practice is a significant factor in evaluating the success of CORE. My intention was to survey the literature in terms of the questions being discussed in this thesis. Those questions include how to design the process structure and agenda, and how to address power imbalances and issues related to public participation. A further problem is how to analyze the degree of conflict resolution relative to conflict management and containment. Another question involves whether consensus can happen only when participants share values and goals. And finally, there is the examination of the relative value of engaging in these processes for grassroots organizations.

In addition to ADR, participant-observer theory and methodology (Burawoy 1991) guided this research, along with a number of theoretical perspectives. However, while theoretical work guided the analysis, reference to the theoretical work is collected in footnotes so as to not intrude into the description and critique of CORE.

Jurgen Habermas informed my analysis through his concepts of strategic and communicative action, as well as his concept of the public sphere. Pierre Bourdieu’s analysis of effective speech being related to the speaker’s socio-economic position, and his explanation of self-censorship and the cultural capital of the dominant class supported my analysis of the unevenness of a round table discussion. The notion of “hegemony” as developed by Antonio Gramsci and Raymond Williams guided my analysis of the different value systems,
perceptions and goals among the participants. The concept of hegemony not only refers to dominance in economic and political activities but also to cultural, social and psychological experiences. Hegemony describes “the relations of domination and subordination, in their forms as practical consciousness, as in effect a saturation of the whole process of living” (Williams 1988 110). However, Williams reminds us that

a lived hegemony is always a process...It is a realized complex of experiences, relationships, and activities, with specific and changing pressures and limits...We have to add to the concept of hegemony the concepts of counter hegemony and alternative hegemony, which are real and persistent elements of practice (Williams 1988 113).

I then used T. S. Kuhn’s notion of paradigms, that is, belief systems about the world, and Stephen Cotgrove’s study of environmentalist and industrialist paradigms to examine the fundamentally opposed value systems operating at the CORE table.

**Research methodology.**

My involvement with CORE was multifaceted. Throughout the process I had extensive conversations with Donna Gross, the spokesperson for fishery interests at the Vancouver Island table, who sat through the numerous hours of meetings over the one-year period. I also attended many CORE meetings, especially toward the end of the process. I kept notes throughout the meetings with Gross and at the CORE table. I reported to the members of the Commercial
Fishing Industry Council (CFIC), a federally sponsored, umbrella organization representing fishing industry sectors including vessel owners and processing companies, as well as the organizations representing various gear types, including the UFAWU, which represents both fishers and shoreworkers. The information and analysis contained in this paper is based on my participant observation, indirect observation through field interviews during the year of the process, as well as direct, formal interviews with representatives from each sector. The indirect observations include the above-mentioned discussions as well as discussion with people who had chosen not to participate in the process such as NGOs, fishing groups and individuals. I received all of the minutes from the CORE meetings, newsletters and other written material on CORE from groups involved. Finally, I also kept an extensive newspaper clipping file on CORE.

Between December 1992 and March 1993, after the table officially stopped meeting, I had a formal one-to-two-hour meeting with a representative from each sector, except the Provincial Government sector representative who was a cabinet appointee who represented neither federal nor local government, nor a community sector. While the government steering committee was made up of senior staff of government agencies, the government sector representative Murray Rankin reported directly to cabinet. The Government Sector Interest Statement reflected the anomalous position of this sector:

Government has a unique three-faceted role at the Table in that it participates as a Sector with interests in the negotiation, is responsible for review and approval of the Table’s recommendations, and must develop,
fund and implement the final determination (plan) (Government Sector Interest Statement).³

Rankin’s job included, “improving public understanding of the objectives and impacts of new resource initiatives, such as the Protected Areas Strategy” (Government Interest Statement), as well as being a conduit to cabinet for recommendations, such as the economic transition strategy, coming from the table. Yet he was also an active negotiator at the table. Since this was not a self-constituted, community-based sector, I did not feel that the set of questions I asked of the other interest groups was appropriate for the government sector.

However, with each of the other sectors I had a formal interview wherein I asked each representative the same set of questions. I tape-recorded and then transcribed the interviews verbatim. I was very pleased at how open and cooperative everyone was in terms of giving me formal interview time. I think that this cooperation came from the relationship I was able to build with people at the table as well as from the fact that participants wanted to analyze the process, share insights and perspectives, and evaluate the effectiveness of the forum.

Financing

The issue of unequal financial resources among the sectors was fervently but informally discussed at the CORE meetings, and it became a key question that I addressed in my formal interviews. Details regarding unequal financial resources are taken up in Chapter Three, “The Myth of Round Table Equality”. Although
there was a procedural document outlining how participant funding could be assessed, many participants (Tourism, Outdoor Recreation, Youth, Fishery, Local Government, Social and Economic Sustainability, and Conservation), expressed their sense that the CORE staff had made arbitrary decisions regarding funding. Furthermore, many representatives were hampered in their participation because of inadequate financial resources. None of these sector’s participants received remuneration for their participation, nor did they feel they had enough money to pay expenses or for technical information. Each sector had a steering committee which they reported to outside of the meetings, and each sector was formally allowed one spokesperson at the table. However, it was also necessary to have other sector participants present at each meeting to give advice as well as to attend side meetings regarding technical issues. Some sectors had the resources for numerous participants at each meeting (Forest managers and Manufacturers, Forest Employment, Forest Independents and Conservation), while others such as Tourism, General Employment and Fishery were not able to supply an equal number of volunteers for each meeting.

Further, there were many other resources the forest companies had - an entourage of paid management staff and foresters, vast resources for communication support work during and between CORE sessions, laptops, cellular phones and so on. There are two sources of disparity in resources: the different financial resources, and the skills and power that go along with that economic privilege, and secondly, the amount of participant funding each sector received.
Sector representatives

I now introduce the sector participants, starting with those who received the greatest amount of participant funding from CORE and descending to those who received the least amount of participant funding.

Conservation - Paul Senez (Interviewed February 8, 1994).

The Conservation sector received the greatest amount of participant funding from CORE - $47,015.59. This sector had three seats at the table, and Paul Senez from the Sierra Club in Victoria was one of the key participants. This sector received three seats because of the many and diverse groups on Vancouver Island participating in Conservation activities and because, as Saul Arbess from the Carmanah Forestry Society argued, the Conservation sector negotiated "that equality of representation be granted to E-CORE [the environmental constituency] to achieve parity with resource-extraction interests" (*Watershed Sentinel* December/January 1992/1993). The Conservation sector included direct representation from the Sierra Club of Western Canada, BC Wild - The Conservation Alliance, Alberni Environmental Coalition, Carmanah Forestry Society and others.

Senez participated in the CORE process as part of his salaried work with the Sierra Club.
Social and Economic Sustainability (SESS) - Heather Pate
(Interview February 14, 1994).

Heather Pate, a Campbell River Chamber of Commerce employee, was one of several spokespeople for this sector:

Our sector formed itself out of a number of interest groups, and we also tried to give ourselves geographic representation, so in an overlapping way we ended up with particular viewpoints such as Chambers, Canadian Women in Timber, Pacific Resource Education Society (which is not a Share group), BC Industrial Merchants, Regional Economic Development and Community Futures.

This sector received the second highest amount of participant funding at $40,835.96.

Outdoor Recreation - Les Carter (Interview February 25, 1994).

Les Carter was the spokesperson for the Outdoor Recreation Sector which received the third highest funding at $38,197.72. A former lawyer, Carter was a volunteer for his sector in CORE. This sector was made up of organizations which included the B.C. Wildlife Federation, the Federation of B.C. Naturalists, the Steelhead Society, the Recreational Canoeing Association of B.C., the Lapidary, Rock and Mineral Society of B.C., and the Four Wheel Drive Association of B.C. He described the thinking of his sector's constituency:

We don't just stand for the preservation of things just for the preservation of them. We are users. We want to sit at the table and explain the relationship between human beings and their built-in fundamental need to
interact with nature. That was the role that we tried to play all along; that this was a multi-stakeholder thing not just a battle between the greens and the browns.

**Youth - Zane Parker (Interview January 31, 1994).**

The Youth sector, also known as "Group Representing Youth for Future Interest Now" (GRYFIN), had a number of spokespeople, one of whom was Zane Parker. This sector was organized through a conference funded by CORE in November 1992 in Parksville. Stephen Owen was enthusiastic about the formation of a youth sector and the CORE staff said if the youth organizers could get a "truly representative" sector then they would have a seat at the table. Said Parker, "for the November conference, invitations were sent to youth groups, student councils, church groups, although there wasn't too much Native involvement, fifty kids came to the conference and the sector was formed".

This sector received $36,028.64 in participant funding.

**Tourism - Linda Petch (Interview January 26, 1994).**

The umbrella organization for the Tourism sector was TAVI - the Tourist Association of Vancouver Island.

Linda Petch did not participate in CORE until August 1993. After that she became the chief spokesperson for her sector, which included tourism businesses in rural and urban settings, tourism marketers, and employees in
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Forest Independents - Rick Jerrey (Interview, February 8, 1994).
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activities. For the woodlot people, same thing; less availability for woodlot tenures. And for the re-manners and the independent mills, as the AAC is reduced, so is their ability to purchase logs on the open market because the major licensees who control most of the wood then have to use that wood in their own mills. The one thing that we all did share in common was that we were rural-based small independent firms and we worked where we lived.

Forest Employment - Kim Pollock (Interview February 25, 1994).

I interviewed Kim Pollock, Director of Environment and Land Use, International Woodworkers of America-Canada (IWA.) While IWA vice-president Warren Ulley was the key spokesperson, Pollock attended all the meetings on Vancouver Island. Both Ulley and Pollock are salaried IWA employees and attendance at CORE meetings was part of their work. However, as Pollock pointed out, half of his weekends in 1993 were taken up with CORE since he was also involved in the East Kootenay’s CORE table.

The Forest Employment Sector also had other local representatives at the table. This was a unique sector inasmuch as the Forest Employment Sector representatives received daily per diem from CORE which other sectors did not. This occurred because representatives could show the direct relationship between booking time off work and attending CORE meetings. Financial support from CORE to this sector came to an overall total of $25,213.24.

Pollock explains the organization of the Forest Employment sector:

The sector consists of four forest unions based on Vancouver Island. The four include the IWA-Canada, Communications, Energy and Paperworkers (CEP), Pulp and Paperworkers of Canada (PPWC) and the Longshoremen’s Union. Essentially it was an effort to find a common
bargaining position amongst forest unions because we thought that through a united front we could achieve more than separately.

Fishery - Donna Gross (Interview February 9, 1994).

A United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union member from the historic Malcolm Island fishing community of Sointula, Donna Gross, was the main spokesperson for the Fishery Sector. She did this as a volunteer activity and the Fishery Sector received $14,677.64 in participant funding.

Gross explained how she became involved in the CORE process:

I started making contacts with various fishing organizations and then contacted the Commercial Fishing Industry Council (CFIC), which brings together fishermen from throughout the coast and all the gear types. I was invited to a meeting to present the CORE mandate for the Fisheries sector to see at that point whether they wanted to get involved. They agreed to although they were very skeptical about getting involved in yet another consultation since they had been in numerous consultations which hadn't seemed very useful. I represented the people in CFIC and the Cortes Island Seafood Association. Delores Broten was one of the Cortes Island Seafood Association members who also attended most of the CORE meetings.

Mining - Bruce McKnight (Interview February 24, 1994).

Bruce McKnight was the spokesperson for the Mining sector. He undertook his CORE participation as part of his assigned work for Westmin Mines, and he explained the constituency of his sector in this way:

Basically the Mining Association of B.C. and the B.C. Yukon Chamber of Mines, which are the two main associations which deal with mining interests in B.C., collectively appointed me. I was in a public affairs role at
Westmin, one of the main companies operating on Vancouver Island. It was part of my job, but I had to do extra time to do this.

The Mining Sector received $11,751.83.

Agriculture/Aquaculture - Brian Currie (Interview February 9, 1994).

Brian Currie is a civil servant but has a farm and is a Director of the B.C. Agriculture Federation. He participated in CORE as a volunteer and used his annual vacation to cover his lost work time. Currie explained that he enjoyed participating in this type of consultation and saw it as part of his Agriculture Federation professional responsibilities. This sector received $6,858.89 in assistance, which covered expenses for his participation. Currie explained his sector's formation:

The BC Agriculture Federation was notified by CORE staff in October of 1992 that this process was beginning and that agriculture had the option to become recognized as a sector...In about February the aquaculture people, the shellfish growers and the fin fish organization asked if the agriculture sector would represent their interests.

General Employment - Cliff Stainsby (Interview January 19, 1994).

Cliff Stainsby, a researcher with the B.C. Government Employees Union (BCGEU), was the key spokesperson for the General Employment sector. Cliff
received support from his union which allowed him to undertake CORE as part of his assigned workload. His sector consisted of four trade unions which represented a total of 20,000 workers: BCGEU, a public-sector union, and three private-sector unions: Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) at Westmin Mines (who were locked out during the CORE meetings), Operating Engineers, and the Food and Commercial Workers' Union.

The sector received $6,015.60 in CORE assistance funds.

Local Government - Al Huddlestan (Interview February 15, 1994).

This sector received the least financial assistance from CORE - $1,543.60, next to the Forest Managers and Manufacturers which was self-funded. Al Huddlestan was one of its key spokespeople. He described his sector's constituency and his involvement:

I got involved in CORE mostly through having the bad fortune of being the president of the Association of Vancouver Island Municipalities (AVIM) as a result of my being mayor of Port Hardy at the time the process was initiated. All municipalities and districts on Vancouver Island are members of AVIM.

The Association of Vancouver Island Municipalities represents all municipalities on Vancouver Island.
While the Forest Managers and Manufacturers sector received no funding from CORE, Sholto Hebenton, a Harvard-educated lawyer trained in alternate-dispute negotiation, was the paid representative for the FMM sector. The six forest companies involved in the negotiation - MacMillan Bloedel, Canadian Forest Products, Western Forest Products, Fletcher Challenge Canada, Pacific Forest Products and International Forest Products - collectively paid Hebenton's fees to represent their interests at the table. I interviewed Bill Dumont, Chief Forester with Western Forest Products, who pointed out that since the forest companies are competitors in the marketplace, they hired Hebenton together as it would have been problematic for any one of them to represent all six companies at the table. Further, Hebenton was able to serve as a mediator between the different companies within the FMM sector discussions.

Chapter One Footnotes

1 My work in 1990 and 1991 include being a research consultant for a land-use planning company, a researcher for Greenpeace, and a community development worker with the Sierra Club. In 1992 I became Executive Director of the T. “Buck” Suzuki Environmental Foundation, an organization working closely with the commercial fishing community on fish habitat issues.
The Land-use Charter was drawn up by the CORE staff and adopted by government. It outlines the principles for land-use planning. A copy of the Land-use Charter is contained in Appendix C.

Sector interest statements can be found in Appendix F.

AAC is the annual allowable cut of harvest levels given to forest companies.

Re-manners are the value-added wood re-manufacturers.
Chapter Two

CORE: Containing Conflict

Conflict resolution did not occur

People participated in the Vancouver Island CORE process because they wanted a resolution of land-use conflicts. The expectation of those who became involved was that people would be drawn together to look at "Vancouver Island and draw lines on the map and say this is what is going to be protected, and this is what is going to be cut" (Paul Senez Conservation Sector Interview February 8, 1994). People joined the process anticipating that there would be "some degree of resolution of the awful land-use conflicts" (Pollock Forest Employment) and that there would be authentic discussion - hard, substantive debate on the issues related to land-use designations.

Resolution was not to occur for several reasons. Throughout the meetings, the process managers contained substantive debate, thereby preventing the discussion necessary to resolve conflict. The pre-set agenda, the facilitation style, the mediation type of discourse, and the fact the meetings were almost entirely process-oriented all contributed to containment of debate. Further, many participants felt that they were compelled to be involved. This sense of compulsion, along with the pre-determined sectoral structure, meant limited opportunities for public input. Finally, there was an unwillingness on the part of
many representatives to accommodate the interests of other groups. Many dealt with the CORE process as a strategic means of maintaining the status quo. The CORE staff "wanted to appear successful in spite of what the end result was; they were concerned about what the ‘optics’ were as Craig Darling [chief Core staff person] would say" (Parker Youth). The overall conclusion of the participants was that the anticipated substantive debate about land-use and discussion to resolve the associated conflicts were contained and subverted by the CORE process.

**Compelled to participate**

Groups said they felt compelled to participate in the process; they were not able to choose to not participate since they felt that their interests and needs had to be represented at CORE or they would lose out. As McKnight (Mining) said:

> We thought we were sort of losing ground, almost literally I guess, for years - we were going to try to avoid losing too much more. So the reason we showed up was because we felt we had to participate because it was kind of our last chance to have some say in getting access to the land (McKnight Mining).

As Donna Gross (Fishery) said, "We were held to ransom to participate in this process because if we didn’t, there would be nobody protecting our needs and concerns. We couldn’t choose not to participate" (Gross Fishery). In order for a multi-stakeholder process to be effective, participants have to freely decide that this is the type of forum they want to engage in. No such public "buy-in" consultation occurred; rather the government simply announced that CORE
would take place. The sense of coercion behind participation damaged CORE's potential for becoming a legitimate public forum.

**A predetermined structure and format undermined public involvement and public debate**

The possibility of a self-governing forum was subverted before the process got underway. Before the table was assembled, the representative structure and format of the process were determined by the CORE staff, made up of lawyers, resource managers, and planners. The CORE Commissioner and his staff had determined prior to convening the table that participation would be by "sector." However, if participants at the sub-regional or community level had first of all addressed the question of who should be at the table and what the forum might be, perhaps a more inclusive and functional public involvement model might have been initiated. Les Carter (Outdoor Recreation) pointed out that this formative discussion at the community level "might happen better first of all at the sub-regional level - if people sat down in their own communities and talked about it" (Carter Outdoor Recreation).

Instead of a consultation which surveyed participants' preferences, the orientation manual, already prepared by CORE staff for participants, (British Columbia CORE Orientation Materials: Shared Decision-Making for British Columbia), had pre-ordained a sectoral forum. The manual stated that sectoral representation would occur according to criteria of "effectiveness" and
"inclusiveness" (not defined in the manual). The way it was structured meant that participation could be only through sectors, a non-inclusive public model. A sector was defined as a "major stakeholder or government group which can bring a dimension to the process of resource planning and allocation" (British Columbia Orientation Materials: Shared Decision-making for British Columbia 10). The sectors included broadly-based groups of participants, such as tourism, fishery, mining, youth, outdoor recreation and so on, groups who were assumed to share common concerns and therefore common values.

The structure of the process by sectors violates the principle of inclusion as outlined in the document, Working in Multistakeholder Processes, written by the Evaluation and Interpretation Branch, Ecosystem Conservation Directorate and the Stakeholder Relations Branch Response Assessment Directorate of Environment Canada. This document points out that the design of multistakeholder processes must be undertaken by the members, including rules of procedure and physical arrangements, and must allow for broad public involvement:

A full multistakeholder process may be said to be in place when the members are brought together for a specific purpose, using structures and procedures developed by the members to respond to that purpose. The membership is inclusionary, that is anyone can join. In this way existing groups can be represented as can any other interest, including those who are not part of an organized entity (e.g. local citizen). Encouraging non-aligned members is important since these individuals often bring to the discussions a sense of perspective which is not necessarily influenced by a sectoral or other special interest. These individuals are more likely to ask probing questions, and force those with expertise to demystify their work. (Canada Working in Multistakeholder Processes 49).
The physical arrangement at the table was designed to ensure that participants were contained within their sectors. Each sector had a multi-layered arrangement with "chairs directly at the table for spokespersons. It [would] be best to have a second (and third) row for those in steering groups" (British Columbia CORE Orientation Materials: Shared Decision-making for British Columbia 11) sitting behind the spokespersons. The physical arrangement at the CORE table gave a clear message that participation was limited to people formally associated with a sector.

The shortcomings of CORE as a mediation process

One explanation of why CORE violated the principles of multistakeholder processes is its origin in the tradition of conflict mediation between specific groups, which was then enlarged to include mediation among many groups. The CORE process is a hybrid multi-party forum, which by its definition excluded general public participation since it was designed to mediate conflicts between specific interest groups. Its historical roots lie in the American alternate-dispute-resolution movement which was based on "the art of the possible - a mutual recognition that there are limits on unilateral action and that there may be solutions more advantageous than continued conflict. It is a process in which parties agree to seek a mutually acceptable, formal accommodation of their differences" (Cormick 8). However, as Bruce McKnight (Mining) pointed
out, it is a process

more appropriate in something like a two-party negotiation, like a business
dispute or a marital dispute with a man and wife negotiating over
something, and they have a mediator with them, helping them out. Each
one represents themself (sic), and they know their own interests and have
the power to make a decision and bind themselves to it. In the case of
what we're doing with the sectors, we don't have the same facility to do
that because we're just representing our sectors - and in some cases
we're not even representing them really, we're just representative of our
sectors. We're like a typical example of someone in our sectors (McKnight
Mining).

Sectoral representation excludes the public

CORE took the concerns of organizations, interest groups and individuals,
grouped them together into sectors as efficiently as the numbers would allow,
and handed the debate over to sector “representatives.” The concept of
individuals or members of the public being engaged in this discourse was lost:

The public's inclusion in this process was deficient. The public should
have been invited to the process more vigorously. It was the responsibility
of CORE and the government...to reach out to the public more
energetically. The fact that after the process was completed many people
in all sectors did not know what CORE's initials even stood for was a
problem. In general there should have been the eyes of ordinary people
on the process and there weren't. Nobody was watching (Gross Fishery).

On the ability of the CORE process to bring the land-use debate to the public
sphere, Bruce McKnight (Mining) stated that "the profile of land-use debate
[needs to be raised] away from special interest groups and sent out to the public
domain so that it becomes sort of a main street item that people are talking
about...and bring the debate more into the media" (McKnight Mining). The
Environment Canada document points out that "a smaller group might also fall prey to the accusation that it does not fully represent the community" (Canada Working in Multistakeholder Processes 53), a complaint made about the CORE process made by people both within and outside the process (Gross, McKnight Sector Interviews and Bob Andrew Saltspring Islands Trust Watershed Sentinel December/January 1992/1993). Both the structure of the process and the lack of involvement from people outside the formal process contributed to the weakening of public involvement in this debate.

While the process of creating sectors often resulted in increased unity and understanding among some groups in that sector, on the other hand, it caused some individuals and groups to drop out of the process. Paul Senez from the Conservation sector described such a process:

The environmental community was unorganized, with loose coalitions... but nobody had ever brought all environmental groups on Vancouver Island together... There were about one hundred people at that first meeting...and then there were fewer people. People figured it wasn't for them or that their interests weren't getting met with us (Senez Conservation).

It is clear from this comment that even before the meetings had started, the principle of accessibility to the debate was being violated; people who could not fit into the sector structure were eliminated from the process. Further, those who could not afford the enormous volunteer effort were also excluded. One of the organizations which decided not to participate, the Save Georgia Strait Alliance (SGSA), an organization which speaks for more than eighty local groups, said it "could not afford staff time for a year-long discussion about big trees"
it was felt that they were SHARE groups and somehow SHARE is bad, and they
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representation (and that it was covered by other means) "(Paul Social and
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shouldn't be there. Local government and SESS sectors were able to get seats at the table because of their persistence in maintaining that they represented unique interests not yet participating in the process; "both lobbied hard to get in" (Pate SESS). Another example of a sector which entered the process late and received very little encouragement to be at the table was Fishery. It was even suggested to Fishery representative Donna Gross that commercial fishing interests could be covered by the General Employment sector. Further, the Commercial Fishing Industry Council (CFIC) had invited CORE staff to come to a CFIC meeting and discuss the goals of CORE. This was long after the process had gotten underway and yet CORE staff failed to show up at the first scheduled meeting leaving many in the fishing community with the impression that they were not central to the debate at CORE (Gross Fishery).

And Bruce McKnight of the Mining Sector pointed out that "there are probably other people out there who are significantly different from [those at the table], who are not being represented at all, out there in the general public somewhere" (McKnight Mining).

Who finally gets a seat at the table is ultimately one of the most important strategic aspects of the process. The constitution of the table determines if all "interests" are represented, and moreover gives certain interests more voices at the table and likely more influence. Debate about the definition of what constituted a sector should have been encouraged in a public forum prior to the process getting underway. This would have allowed public discussion of the range of interests needing representation. Further fine tuning of the final number
of seats could have occurred at the first meeting or two of the whole group, but
determination of who got a seat at the table was definitely not a decision which
should have been taken by the CORE staff.

The pre-set agenda

The participants needed to be able to define the topics they thought must be
addressed in this forum. Establishing the points on the agenda is a key aspect of
a public discussion, and it should not be directed by forces outside of the group.
There were a number of restrictions put on the agenda in advance of the
participants sitting down together at the table. The debate about the inclusion of
the forest companies at the table was a case in point.

A number of participants voiced the opinion that the multi-national forest
companies were not part of the community and therefore should not have a seat
at the table. Les Carter (Outdoor Recreation) was one:

On December 4, 1992 I handed out a paper at the table on company
representation in a consensus-based process and pointed out the deep
philosophical problems with company representation at the table. That is
that companies only have one interest and that is making profit (Carter
Outdoor Recreation).

Zane Parker (Youth) also felt the process was seriously undermined:

There should have been a citizens-coming-together and deciding whether
or not they wanted to invite the multinationals, but it was already
preordained that they were going to be at the table. They [the CORE staff]
formulate the question and the terms of reference and then you are asked
what you think of the process, whereas you should decide what the
questions would be (Parker Youth).
The concerns of group members were overruled by the Commissioner and staff, and the forest companies continued to have a seat at the table.

A further containment of authentic debate arose from the fact that the agenda for CORE was pre-set inasmuch as land tenure and logging practices such as clear-cutting were not to be discussed. As George Gibson, Chairman of the Vancouver Island Network of Environmentalists (VINE), a member group of the Conservation Sector, stated in the VINE March 1993 newsletter "the Table has been informed that it does not have a mandate to discuss tenure, forest practices or interim measures and that those areas must be left to Cabinet" (Watershed Sentinel December/January 1992/1993).

Another element of structural predetermination which interfered with the self-governance of the process was the decision as to what geographical areas would be included. The Clayoquot watershed on Vancouver Island was not to be included. The reason given by the CORE staff was that this watershed had already been part of a consensus process. Cliff Stainsby echoed the feeling of many that "if they included the Clayoquot in CORE, then maybe the whole IWA would have walked or the Forest Manufacturers might have walked" (Stainsby General Employment). The Gulf Islands were another area not to be included in the discussions, leading Neil Aitken of the Gabriola Island Alliance to claim a "disenfranchisement" for island residents (Watershed Sentinel December/January 1992/1993). The predetermination of who would sit at the table and what areas and topics would be excluded from the discussion critically limited the debate, overruled dissent and undermined the ability of the group to self-govern its
discussion. This was not an example of a well functioning consensus process, to say the least.

The agenda and the structure of representation were pre-determined by the CORE staff, who were hired by the government-appointed commissioner. The process was instituted by the state rather than emerging as a community-based initiative. Those who engaged in the process felt compelled to do so, while many other individuals and organizations affected by land-use decisions either did not fit into the sector structure of the process or chose to opt out of the process (for example, the Save Georgia Strait Alliance, Western Canada Wilderness Committee, Friends of Clayoquot Sound, Gulf Islands Trusts, many non-affiliated fishers and other citizens). The highly formalized nature of the forum inhibited open debate within the process and formally excluded the general public from engaging in discussion of land-use issues affecting them. The exclusiveness of this format was exacerbated by the fact that CORE did not assign any staff function to ensuring that the public was informed about the content of the debate as it was proceeding. Hence, with no communication to the public, the political will to support recommendations coming out of CORE was not built. The public formed its opinions regarding CORE based on the various sector's media campaigns in reaction to Commissioner Owen's final recommendations.
The South Island Accord - A citizen initiative

In contrast to the state-initiated CORE process, the 1991 South Island Accord was initiated by grassroots’ groups to deal with land-use conflicts. This community-based initiative had the ingredients to be a self-governed forum for public involvement and public debate toward resolution of land-use conflicts. It was an initiative of groups from different perspectives coming together in face-to-face discussions to "publicly declare [their] common ground and unity of purpose in demanding ...changes in the management and stewardship of British Columbia's forest heritage" (South Island Accord). This was an informal and low-key effort on the part of participants, including the International Woodworkers of America-Canada (IWA), the Environmental Youth Alliance, the Sierra Club of Western Canada, the Western Canada Wilderness Committee, the Carmanah Forestry Society and Friends of Carmanah/Walbran to establish "an ongoing dialogue regarding matters of mutual concern ...[and to work] together for constructive change" (South Island Accord). The signing of this accord spawned the larger Jobs and Environment Peace in the Woods committee, which included the signatories to the accord as well as the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union, the Pulp, Paper and Woodworkers Union, and the Canadian Paperworkers Union. This type of small-scale initiative also produce the West Kootenay Accord of 1991 and the Tin Wis Accord of 1989. The South Island Accord is an effort worth noting because it shows that individuals at the community level were willing to sit down together and work towards solving land-
use problems. It is significant that the provincial government and the forestry companies weren't included in the discussions. Although the government and forest companies would eventually have to be included in the debate, some participants say the power imbalance they bring to such forums makes isolating the essence of problems at the community level more difficult. According to Evelyn Pinkerton, UBC planner and Tin Wis Steering Committee member, the "South Island Accord broke the unwritten IWA-major corporation alliance against environmentalists" (Pinkerton 37). A citizen-initiated forum such as the South Island Accord can provide more authentic public involvement and public debate. Delores Broten (Fishery) believes that CORE
derailed [the South Island Accord] altogether. That accord could have been the beginning of a common front of workers and conservationists, and...eventually people had to bring in social justice. The accord was about people showing their intentions to find their common ground; whereas, CORE didn't really have much to do with that dialogue. (Broten Fishery).

A community-based debate about land-use among people involved in the conflicts was in its infancy, but CORE undermined the self-development of that process by containing and funneling discussion into a formalized process which further contained dissension without fostering debate leading to conflict resolution.
CORE - Too process-oriented

One of the main explanations emerging from the interviews as to why debate about substantive issues did not occur at the CORE table is that the discussion was "too process oriented." This comment meant different things to different participants: not a deep enough exploration of the values and interests of the different groups, not enough technical information or, alternatively, too much focus on using technical information to solve conflicts. Regardless of the viewpoint, most felt that the process mediators, both lawyers by training, contained conflict rather than allowing issues to be debated. Participants commented that the process mediators steered the discussions away from the conflicts inherent in land-use issues by focusing too much on process at the expense of debate about substantive issues, by steering the group away from debate about contentious topics, and by interrupting and reframing points being made by participants.

While many participants felt that there was a need for process development, they felt far too little time was spent discussing issues. Bruce McKnight (Mining) felt that spending ninety percent of the time on process and only ten percent on issues was wrong and recommended "it should have been more like fifty-fifty or sixty-forty."

The frustration and failure of not getting down to specific conflicts is reflected in Brian Currie's comment:

Somewhere along the line an agenda should have been created to bring up those kinds of issues related to each protected area directly. On the
agenda say we’re going to discuss Carmanah and the Walbran as protected areas with all the pros and cons. All we did was discuss the theoretical aspects behind the protected areas, all of which is very motherhood and apple pie (Currie Agriculture).

Heather Pate (Social and Economic Sustainability) identified the lack of substantial debate on contentious issues as part of the reason for the negative backlash against the CORE recommendations. Speaking a week after the CORE report was released by Commissioner Owen, Pate said:

An example of a substantial issue avoided at the table is Protected Areas. What do they really mean? What should they really be? The Land-use Designation system, completing the definitions, you can see what really happened by not completing the definitions.

Some participants said unequivocally that the process mediator was determined to have the group avoid conflict. At one point Kim Pollock (Forest Employment) asked the mediator how he was going to get the table moving. His response was, "we really have to keep the parties from getting into a hair pull. It would take very little to blow this thing apart." Pollock added:

these guys embarked from the assumption right from the beginning that they didn't want us to engage on the major issues because we might blow apart. But at some stage that becomes totally counterproductive. We spent a gazillion meetings talking about the vision statement, a gazillion meetings talking about the participation agreement. A gazillion extremely boring sessions trading interest statements back and forth. We wasted up to half a year on all of that shit, which are all basic process preliminaries. The facilitators made the assumption that if they let us engage on the tough stuff, we would have a fight and we would blow up.

Bill Dumont (Forest Managers and Manufacturers) described his perception that there was an avoidance of conflict and further that this suppression of
conflictual debate created further tensions and conflict:

There seemed to be a complete anathema to any emotion at the table, and yet we all know the role emotion and theatrics play in negotiations. That seemed to be not politically correct in this forum. There was some belief that we in the various sectors can't sit down without having a fight. True, in some areas we are adversaries, but in others there is common ground. My opinion is that CORE always saw that they were sitting on some sort of tinder box that was ready to blow. In fact, they became the cause for that, rather than that the issues that were so divisive.

The net outcome of this avoidance of dealing with contentious issues meant that any attempts at communication to reach agreement were undermined.

Linda Petch (Tourism), a professional facilitator herself, explained her approach to conflict resolution:

If we're trying to talk about a problem, let's look at it, name it, describe it. Next step, what are we trying to achieve, what's a collective goal we can come up with. There's a structure to a discussion where you actually engage the issues, where you keep track of the issue and stay on it.

And Al Huddlestan (Local Government) indicated clearly that he wasn't opposed to conflict:

There would have been a lot of hard knocks and maybe a lot of name calling early on, but let everybody sort of vent their concerns and knock heads for a while and then see where it went from there. In other words let the people be in charge of it and not have big brother or somebody that's making $550 a day, and in fact a whole bunch of them in the periphery as well, lurking around trying to steer things.

In other words, in order for genuine conflict resolution to occur, discussion cannot be subject to an over-arching, external authority. The process mediators were not part of the group and they did not facilitate the group in their work. Rather, they were seen to interfere with the debate by containing it.
Most participants perceived the mediator as interrupting the process and thereby sabotaging debate and conflict resolution. As Paul Senez (Conservation) said:

He definitely led the table. He would reframe things when there was a good discussion, and he oftentimes interrupted and tried to reframe things with an analysis that he would put onto the table based on what he'd been listening to, which, more often than not, was completely wrong. He would have been better off to let the discussion go in the direction it was going; it might have got somewhere. I think at times he was manipulating not facilitating.

Many people felt the mediator interfered with discussion by reframing the very language participants were using to explore and present their ideas. As Rick Jeffery (Forest Independents) said the mediator, "kept interrupting conversations, kind of reiterating what he thought the person just said, and lots of times he was reiterating incorrectly. That got people a little bit upset and also stifled the conversation".

Donna Gross (Fishery) also interpreted the mediator's rephrasing as manipulation and interruption of legitimate discussions.

He was an impediment in some ways; he was irritating. I felt that he stopped the movement of the discussion by constantly rephrasing for us and saying "I think what you're trying to say is" and it was absolutely not what I was trying to say. "Would you shut up?" was what I felt like saying. He talked too much, got in the way too much. He kept interpreting different initiatives on the table and putting the kibosh on some of them saying the government wouldn't go for them. He would say, "I think you're heading down the wrong track; they won't go for it." At which time the response would be, "Well, how do you know?".
This comment reflects a perception that not only did the mediator undermine the possibility for a self-governed debate but that he might have been doing so as an agent for the government which set this process into motion.

This perception underlines the broader perception that CORE was a process managed so that the fight between conservation and industry could take place out of the media spotlight so that the government would not have to deal with their own media problems related to land-use conflicts. As Cliff Stainsby (General Employment) reflected, "[CORE] is a no-lose thing for [the government]. It helped them to win the election for one thing; they vowed to get rid of the war in the woods" (Stainsby General Employment).

Unwillingness of participants to accommodate each other's interests

Another containment factor was the intention of some of the participants to maintain or strengthen their interests rather than find a way to accommodate other interests. Some participants stated that they were involved so that they could explain their interests and concerns and learn about the concerns of other interest groups so as to find common ground. Others arrived with the intention of maintaining or gaining ground for their sector and were not prepared to listen to other perspectives. The process never allowed for an overt and honest examination of the different intentions; hence communication became distorted and inauthentic.
CORE: A communication exercise to find common ground or a strategic negotiation to maintain or gain ground?

CORE was different things to different people. While all participants acknowledged they were entering a land-use planning process, the approaches to entering the discussions were different, as were the goals. Some of CORE's problems may be understood by focusing on the differing approaches of the participants. Some approached the discussions as an opportunity to communicate values with the assumption that through sharing and understanding one another's values the possibility of finding common ground would be enhanced. Zane Parker from the Youth Sector reflected such an intention:

Our sector initiated the Vision statement because we thought that if the table couldn't even agree on basic values that we shared, what hope was there on reaching consensus on land-use planning, which essentially comes out of the values you hold in the land? (Parker Youth).

Other participants who saw CORE as a negotiation process, proceeding through trade-offs based upon an explicit recognition of differing interests, and culminating in a compromise more or less acceptable to the parties involved. Heather Pate from SESS reflects this approach, "by negotiating and explaining where you're at we can say we can meet your needs and my needs by doing it this way" (Pate SESS).

While Pate's action showed she wanted to communicate her perspective and hear the other side in a fairly transparent exchange of ideas, Kim Pollock (Forest
Employment) also wanted an exchange of ideas in a bargaining session where he had pre-set goals. He commented that his sector had three objectives in participating in CORE: "one was basically to come to some kind of resolution of land-use struggles; two, to persuade the Table that logging is not an either/or sort of choice; and three, to arrive at what came to be called an economic transition strategy" (Pollock Forest Employment).

A different approach reflecting strategic action with a hidden agenda is reflected in Les Carter’s statement that he was:

trying to change how the forest industry worked. I was trying to change the world view, basically, of the people within the industry, particularly at the professional forester level who always gets sent in to trouble-shoot these things. Because if you can get the words to start to change, eventually the ideas will start to change too (Carter Outdoor Recreation).

And then there was the action oriented to maintaining the status quo as reflected in Bruce McKnight from the Mining Sector who said "our objective was to try to avoid - well, we had thought we were sort of loosing ground, almost literally I guess, for years - we were going to try to avoid loosing too much more."

If CORE had provided a forum where dissent and differences were respected and allowed to be put on the table rather than stifled and contained, then participants with firm and fixed opinions who had a willingness to listen to other viewpoints while negotiating their own pre-determined objectives could have debated productively with one another. Unfortunately, that was not the case.

Some people came to the CORE table with the intention of engaging in communicative action wherein they would express their concerns and goals to
reach an accommodation on contentious issues. As Donna Gross put it, "a process of compromise to the end of finding areas upon which agreement could be reached and using those areas as the goal...of designating the land in such a way that competing interests could live side by side" (Gross Fishery). The accommodation principle in shared decision-making, where "those who will be affected by that decision are empowered to jointly seek an outcome that accommodates rather than compromises the interests of all concerned" (British Columbia CORE Orientation Materials: Shared Decision-making for British Columbia 3) allows for a reasonable solution. This type of resolution could occur if participants "harmonize their individual plans of action" (Habermas 1984 294). However, interviews with participants clearly indicated that each felt that many sectors were not engaged in authentic communicative action, but were intending to reach strategic goals.

Accusations flew back and forth during CORE, as well as afterwards, between forest and conservation sectors, accusations that the other side never wanted to negotiate and arrive at an agreement in the first place. Kim Pollock said this of environmentalists:

The large high-profile environmental groups have no interest whatsoever in a compromise solution. They have an interest, in fact, in not solving these issues. If you depend on contributions from alienated urbanites who feel bad about the way things are going out in the world and want us to stop doing all the bad things, then you are going to make a lot more money if you stand out on the logging roads on your principles and enjoin people to contribute to this noble fight to save the big trees than if you go to a negotiating forum like CORE (Pollock Forest Employment).
Interestingly, Pollock admitted that he didn't think his side wanted a deal either:

I think there are people in the industry who want CORE to fail because they want to ditch the government. "Survive to '95." Just as an example: the companies kept wanting us to crank up the price tag of the transition strategy. And why did they want us to crank up the price tag of the transition strategy? To make the thing so expensive that nobody would want to fund it so that the process would fail (Pollock Forest Employment).

And Les Carter observed that:

No matter how well-intentioned and committed the members of the Forest Managers and Manufacturers steering committee, it was clear that they were sent as a damage-control team by higher powers whose only concern was what the process was going to cost them (Carter Outdoor Recreation).

Some participants such as Kim Pollock were willing to engage in traditional negotiations:

I honestly don't have any qualms about good old fashioned positional bargaining. I mean that's the way unions work after all. My sense of it is that if you scratch interest-based negotiations, you get positional bargaining every time. And I don't see any real problem in basically taking off the masks and saying, "Okay, we have differing interests and differing objectives and differing intents here, but let's make a deal." In the process of doing that, we might yell at one another a little bit and we might pound our fists on the table a little bit, but at the end of the day we may actually come up with something we can all live with (Pollock Forest Employment).

However, this honest, although contentious, debate did not take place at the table.

An example of the unwillingness of some participants to listen to the issues and concerns of other sectors was the way in which the presentation of the "interest statements" was handled. Each sector brought forward an interest
statement, which was to explain their needs, desires, concerns, fears, or hopes. This exercise could have encouraged further communicative action; however, rather than providing open discussion resulting in greater understanding, the participants presenting their interest statements found:

the questioners [members from other sectors] were in an adversarial relationship with those being questioned. The questions were accusatory, and the answers defensive...There was little understanding that exploring the interests behind an initial statement would further the process, whereas defending and retrenching the initial statement would not. The psychological conditions did not exist that would permit the doubt and soul-searching needed for real exploration (Carter Outdoor Recreation).

How would participants behave if they were trying to find common ground rather than advance their own positions? According to Paul Senez (Conservation):

It is getting beyond that kind of positional, posturing type of affair, and getting to stating honestly what are my interests and my needs. Perhaps being honest with those the first time round and not this awkward schtick (Senez Conservation).

That some sectors were protecting their interests to the exclusion of listening to the concerns of other interests was a reoccurring complaint among participants. As Heather Pate (Social and Economic Sustainability Sector) explained:

CORE needed an "AA" - an attitude adjustment. First of all, to come there and take the time to understand what the other people's needs are. There were people who did not want to do that. They knew what they needed, and that's all they were interested in. And knowing what they needed they had already solved the problem and come up with an answer, and any answer that was different than that was unacceptable. So you can't have consensus (Pate Social and Economic Sustainability).
Linda Petch (Tourism) further added her perception that the Forest Managers and Manufacturers had a pre-determined position they were not prepared to change:

Stan Coleman of MacBio, time after time after time, said, 'We need twelve million cubic metres,' and even when it was pointed out that that was eighty-eight percent of the land on Crown land and that their position meant that they needed all of the land outside of the twelve percent protected area for forestry, he never moved off that (Petch Tourism).

In addition, participants must come with an honest intention of engaging in substantive debate about the issues rather than intending to use the forum to maintain or strengthen their own position. Needless to say, each participant will arrive at the discussion with a set of interests and values, but as Tourism representative Petch pointed out:

That's fine for everyone to put their interests on the table, but then you need to investigate what the conflicts are that are inherent in those various interests and positions. You need to explore those conflicts and see if you can somehow reconcile and work them out (Petch Tourism).

Further, if following honest discussion of points of conflicts, in the cases where agreement cannot be reached, it is necessary for participants to be clear about the substance of the disagreement and then to agree to disagree. Finally, in order for conflicts to be resolved, there must be specific and substantive debate; contentious issues must be dealt with directly. Petch had a further comment on this aspect of conflict resolution:

Putting an idea out, and then having it recorded so that it's not lost, and then going back and engaging the issue against some standard that we were trying to meet, seeing what people could give, but not letting your issue go until it was examined. Things like that weren't done. Even though
it went on for so long, there really wasn't any examination of an issue (Petch Tourism).

**Social engineering not consensus**

As CORE Commissioner Stephen Owen said, "we kept the war out of the woods for a year" (quoted by Donna Gross Fishery Sector Interview February 9, 1994). This perception of social engineering on the part of the government contrasts with the notion of a self-governing community nurturing an open debate over differences in an effort to hammer out feasible compromises that take into consideration different groups' interests, perspectives and needs. It is this latter type of debate which was and still is needed. Issues remained unresolved and have surfaced in protests on the street. Unable to reach consensus through CORE (a consensus report with recommendations from the table was the intended outcome), Stephen Owen was left to write a report and recommendations.

In Owen's report were recommendations concerning "Regionally Significant Lands" which laid out land-use directives for various types of protected areas. Since the issue of protected areas was unresolved at the CORE table, participants from the forestry-related sectors were very angry at this recommendation since it meant removal of more areas from logging. These sectors expressed their anger in a well organized yellow-ribbon march to the steps of the Parliament buildings in Victoria. These participants had turned to the government through their participation in CORE to deal with their interests, but
they felt the CORE process failed them. While CORE was supposed to draw people out of acrimonious media events, the end result was conflict in the streets, again covered by all the major media.

What was needed was authentic debate about areas of conflict among groups affected by land-use policy. This debate also needed to be broadened to include members of the public not formally affiliated with organizations but nonetheless affected by how land is used in British Columbia. Conflict and dissent had to be faced squarely. Issues needed to be discussed through communicative action where participants listened and spoke with the intention of arriving at acceptable agreements that were respectful of different needs and perspectives. Instead, the debate was carried out in a state-initiated process where the agenda was pre-set; dissent was contained, and the public at large was excluded. The consequence is continued unresolved conflict.

Even if debate had not been contained by the structure and management of discussion, resolution of conflict through CORE would still have been very difficult to achieve given the inequality of resources among participants, the focus of the next chapter.

**Chapter two footnotes**

1 Hereafter references to interviews will be cited in brief, e.g. Senez Conservation.

2 In the late 1980s the "Share" movement emerged in Canada. There is Share the Forest, Share our Resources, Share the Stein, Share the Carmanah, Share the Clayoquot, etc., which are part of an umbrella organization, Share B.C. The Share movement is made up of citizen groups - grassroots organizations of loggers, their families and other townspeople from resource-based communities.
Their goals are to maintain their jobs in the forest industry and their way of life in rural B.C., which means they often have similar logging production goals as the large forest companies they work for. According to newspaper accounts, Share groups have received donations from trans-national forest companies such as MacMillan Bloedel. The Share movement has its roots in the American "multiple use" and "wise use" movements whose chief organizer is Ron Arnold. Arnold's message to industry is clear. He advises "industry to 'turn the public against environmentalists' through pro-industry activist groups" (Hume), and further says, "my bottom line was, 'Give them [the coalitions] the money. You stop defending yourselves, let them do it, and you get the hell out of the way.' Because citizen's groups have credibility and industries don't" (Goldenthal).

3 The South Island Accord can be found in Appendix B.
Chapter Three

The Myth of Round Table Participant Equality

The fallacy of equality

CORE Commissioner Stephen Owen maintains that "the 'politics of inclusion' are here to stay, not simply because they are demanded but also because they ensure results that better fulfill the broad public interest than decisions that are shaped by the lobbying of powerful and vocal interests" (Roseland 1). Reflected in this statement is the notion that consensus negotiation in a multi-stakeholder decision-making forum ensures involvement and a more democratic outcome. This chapter will examine the fallacy that CORE resisted the powerful lobbying of the forest sector. In fact, the land tenure rights of forest companies went unchallenged. The chapter will also argue that all the sectors were not treated equally; rather, the powerful Conservation and Forestry sectors were given more authority in the discussions than were other interests, and women were significantly underrepresented at the table. The final issue examined in this chapter is the impact of the disparity in negotiating experience and skills various participants brought to the discussions.

French cultural theorist, Pierre Bourdieu, has developed a number of concepts which have strengthened my analysis of the lack of equality between the participants. Comments from Bourdieu regarding censorship and self-
censorship, cultural capital and the socio-economic context of speaking can be found in the footnotes.

Power from legal rights to the land-base

The 1991 seminal BC Round Table on the Environment and Economy document on round table consensus processes claims that consensus "levels the playing field" because "for a defined period of time on the issues that the participants have agreed to address, they participate as equals" (British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and the Economy Reaching Agreement 4). This notion obfuscates the fact that the forest companies have legal control over the land base which gives them enormously greater negotiating power than any other sector. This makes participation unequal. Any attempt to scrutinize a negotiation session by examining the individuals in the session in isolation from their power base outside is naive. ¹

Most of B.C.'s Crown lands are under the control of forest companies through legal agreements called Tree Farm Licenses. The current land tenure system should have been a legitimate point of discussion in the CORE debate. The power and wealth derived by the companies through this land tenure created significant power imbalances among participants regardless of the fact they were sitting at a 'round' table. Paul Senez (Conservation) commented on the disingenuous nature of this aspect of the process:

The forest companies have legally entrenched rights, and that's the land tenure system... They had more power at the CORE table than other
sectors because of their legal rights, and they operate with a completely different mind-set because of the fiduciary duty of a board of directors of a corporation to make a profit for its shareholders (Senez Conservation).

In order for equal engagement in a negotiation process, participants must have something with which to negotiate. Negotiations are based on trading one item for another. Forest companies had their rights to land to trade, the forest employment sector could withhold their labour, and the conservation sector had a certain amount of media clout, although potential media coverage is a hard item to quantify and trade.

At least the Conservation sector had a certain cultural capital in their media access, and the Conservation sector was also at the centre of the war-in-the-woods debate between environmentalists and loggers and logging companies. This central placement as a key player in the logging/environmentalist debate was not enjoyed by other sectors who were often left to be incidental observers at the CORE discussions. Immediate authority was given to the exchange between the Forest Managers and Manufacturers sector (FMM) and the Forest Employment sector and the Conservation sector, second in importance was the Forest Independents sector because of their immediate involvement in the timber industry, and a third layer of authority was given to the other sectors. As Rick Jeffery (Forest Independents) pointed out, "it definitely turned into this battle of forestry interests versus conservation interests" (Jeffery Forest Independents). This happened despite the best efforts to achieve equal participation by other interests who, as Les Carter (Outdoor Recreation) said, tried to make the
process a "multi-stakeholder thing, not just a battle between the greens and browns" (Carter Outdoor Recreation).

All sectors were not treated equally at the table, but women in particular lacked representation and legitimacy.

Unequal gender representation

The noticeable gender inequality at CORE further exemplifies the general lack of responsible representation. Women were underrepresented as spokespeople even though the constituencies of many sectors were predominantly women. And even at the table, women were marginalized and ignored. On many occasions, the entire group sitting at the table was male; at the best of times, only two or three out of a group of twenty would be women.

Cliff Stainsby (General Employment) pointed out that many sectors could have been represented by women. In fact, much of the work done in public-interest groups, such as in the Conservation sector, is done by women (Stainsby General Employment).

The lack of any female participants in the Forest Employment and Forest Managers and Manufacturers sectors was interpreted by Les Carter (Outdoor Recreation) as an example of how those sectors treat "the world ecosystem very much in the same way that men have got into the habit of treating women, as a resource to be exploited and as a colony to do the dirty work" (Carter Outdoor Recreation).
Many participants speculated that the reason so few women participated in CORE was because of the requirement that representatives spend nights and full weekends away from family, a prospect difficult for women, who are still the principal care-givers in most families. The time commitment and scheduling considerations involved in round table consensus processes are a strong disincentive to women's equal participation.

The lack of representation by women in sectors such as Conservation, where there were women participants, was interpreted as blatant censorship by Donna Gross (Fishery) who "found that women were very much ignored. (I) attended a [Conservation sector] meeting in which several of the women were recognized and asked to speak and then were interrupted - backs turned, literally" (Gross Fishery).

Linda Petch (Tourism) put forward the notion that while women might fully participate in a sector's activities outside CORE, the style of discourse at CORE was more familiar to men than to women, "it's not that they're not competent, but sometimes some women participants were at a disadvantage because the men sitting around the table were more practiced at positioning and at bluffing" (Petch Tourism).

**Inequality in negotiating power**

The myth that by the simple fact that there is a round table discussion people will "participate as equals" (British Columbia Round Table on the Environment
and the Economy Reaching Agreement 4) must be unmasked because it helps to maintain the status-quo. Forest companies not only have greater power because of their legal rights to the land, but it is also most likely that forest company executives and their lawyers will control the negotiations. 4

Participants at the Vancouver Island CORE table did not have equal amounts of cultural capital, in the form of the discursive style of the dominant class whose members are perceived as more linguistically competent since their communication is the “realization of the norm” (Bourdieu 1977 638). Mastery of the expected form of communication at round table negotiations such as CORE is the "cultural capital" of the dominant class. The discourse of consensus negotiation is built on lowered voices, "reasoned" arguments, non-tactile interaction, politeness and turn-taking. Even though everyone at a negotiating table may have an equal turn at speaking, they don't necessarily participate "as equals." Sector representatives brought with them an array of differing resources in their style of verbalization, body language, dress, reading skills, knowledge base, social relationships, material possessions and negotiating experience, and these differing resources gave them differing amounts of authority.

The differing educational and occupational backgrounds of the participants resulted in different linguistic and negotiating styles, and in the context of CORE these different styles were perceived as an indication of greater or lesser ability in the CORE context. Further, some participants, such as Donna Gross, indicated that it was very difficult to articulate her points in the style which was being privileged by the process. Instead of the discussion resulting in consensus
- a group agreement on substance and sentiment - often negotiations were a bullying session driven by the most outspoken and strongest-willed participants.

As Craig Darling, facilitator for the earlier Clayoquot Sound process and then staff person for the Vancouver Island CORE process explained about the earlier Clayoquot Sound process:

The agreements reached by the [Clayoquot Sound] Task Force were the outcome of an adversarial contest of wills. Consequently, they should be construed as no more than barely acceptable compromises which resulted only when the protagonists could no longer sustain the will to oppose (Darling 39).

Continuing to maintain a position in the face of opposing views requires confidence and experience in that type of debating forum. Previous participation in negotiations, such as company or union negotiators might have had, greatly tipped the scales against those without this experience. In fact, the negotiation became an exploitative communication. As the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union representative on the B.C. Round Table (a different round table forum, but one based on a similar discursive style) commented on his experience at the Round Table, "consensus is when you agree to something because you can't think of what to say against it. You should see those guys. It's hard to keep thinking of something to say when you're up against people with big educations." (UFAWU member Edgar Birch Interview January 25, 1992). As Jim Britell, ex-bureaucrat-come-environmentalist points out, "just as people sometimes quietly choke to death in restaurants rather than draw attention to themselves, environmentalists will sometimes smother their objections rather than disturb
comity. Agencies take advantage of this fact" (Britell 21). The level of past success and experience with such forums will provide the participant with the self-perception of how appropriate it is to persist in stating a viewpoint or pressing an issue. Thus it is difficult for some to participate fully in the negotiation, and certainly the situation is not equal.

The consequent confidence level of corporate executives gives them the edge to be far more assertive in their negotiations. Les Carter (Outdoor Recreation), in referring to the Forest Managers and Manufacturers, argued that "there's a big psychological advantage to having a world view that says "I am the hard-headed executive" who makes the decisions and everybody jumps. We hold all the power and we can call the shots" (Carter Outdoor Recreation).

A further factor leading to inequality was the discrepancy in the knowledge bases of the different participants. Linda Petch (Tourism) pointed out that some participants "wouldn't have a substantive background, or sometimes because of their geographical location in a remote community without good telecommunication equipment, they just wouldn't have background to get the information that they needed" (Petch Tourism).

**The process didn't address the equality issues**

The staff at the Vancouver Island CORE table did little to deal with such inequality among participants. An orientation manual was produced for participants of the Vancouver Island table, but it did not in any way give notice,
let alone advice, regarding the inherently strategic nature of the CORE negotiations. The manual outlined, in text-book, flow-chart style, the decision-making process people should go through to achieve a successful conclusion. However, much of the advice given in the orientation material had to do with participants assessing "the appropriateness and feasibility of using a shared decision-making approach" (British Columbia CORE Orientation Materials: Shared Decision-Making in British Columbia 6). This advice was of no assistance to participants who felt compelled to participate in the process.

Inadequate consideration was given to the literacy level of participants and to the clarity of the text. The orientation manual was full of jargon on how to discriminate between "distributive and integrative strategies" or the "conjunctive description" and "obtaining affirmation" (British Columbia CORE Orientation Materials: Shared Decision-Making in British Columbia 26-29). This was inaccessible and non-strategic advice to participants and did not "level the playing field."

On the other hand, many corporate executives have had formal training, as part of their academic background, in using group interaction to manage conflict. As Britell points out:

Controlling interactive group processes, managing interorganizational conflict, and using formal planning processes to further predeveloped policy agendas are subjects taught in graduate schools of labor law, business, and public administration. Managing formal interactions of people with conflicting goals is as much a discipline as biology or forestry. While activists have been studying ecology, our agency friends have been learning the art of manipulation by planning and negotiating (Britell 21).
Furthermore, company executives take expensive training sessions about the strategies and techniques of consensus negotiation. A typical session held in Vancouver in February 1992, entitled "Reaching Consensus through Multi-Stakeholder Negotiations" was summarized in a promotional flyer by the same name. It illustrates how the corporate sector can appropriate consensus negotiation. The cost for the one-day session was more than $600, a prohibitive fee for workers or volunteer environmentalists. Those encouraged to register were people whose daily work involves linguistic and negotiation skills similar to those used in consensus negotiation, individuals such as the vice-president or director of media or public affairs.

The training session was intended to provide such corporate executives with the skills and strategies to deal with:

- Diverse publics with specialized knowledge about ecological issues, environmental groups scrutinizing your operating procedures, governments implementing tougher legislation and regulation ("Reaching Consensus through Multi-stakeholder Negotiations" promotional flyer 1992).

The session promised:

- In-depth presentations [about] how Canadian organizations such as Shell Canada, the Energy Resources Conservation Board and the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association have avoided or resolved environmental disputes by establishing and maintaining constructive dialogue before, during and after the consensus building process ("Reaching Consensus through Multi-stakeholder Negotiations" promotional flyer 1992).

Not only did the discursive style of the process advantage the FMM sector, but they also had access to advice on how to manage consensus multi-stakeholder processes. Britell comments that, "It's hard enough to play hardball when you
don't even have a mitt. Influencing public policy is a game of rules, strategy, and skill" (Britell 21).

Unequal financial resources

Yet another significant factor which influenced the effectiveness of different CORE participants was the amount of time and level of financial resources different sector representatives could bring to the process. Not only was the FMM sector able to hire a highly trained lawyer, but they also had tremendous access to technical information and secretarial support as well as to foresters and executive-level company managers who attended each session. The uneven financial resources meant that in the end the status quo was maintained. For example, the representative of the Forest Managers and Manufacturers was paid a handsome daily rate for both his preparation and attendance at meetings as well as for meetings held amongst the FMM sector scheduled outside the CORE meetings.

The range of support systems, both in terms of financial resources and time, available to each sector varied enormously. Some representatives attended the CORE meetings as part of their employment duties, while others were paid by their constituent groups. The Forest Employment sector representatives were paid to attend the sessions with CORE funds. This was possible because CORE funding was made available to reimburse participants for wages lost while attending the CORE sessions. This reimbursement policy was not available to
anyone who could not provide written verification of lost time from work such as a self-employed fisher preparing his or her boat for the next season, or for a student from the Youth sector who was taking time away from studying or a job search to attend meetings. Furthermore, participants could claim only for lost wages resulting from actual meeting time; they could not claim for the many hours of preparation time, time spent meeting with their constituents, or travel time, which usually added two days to each two-day meeting.

Some sectors received funding from outside CORE, such as Conservation, which received funding from the West Coast Environmental Law Dispute Resolution Fund. In contrast, eight out of twelve sectors participated in CORE as a very time-consuming volunteer activity, receiving neither payment nor time-release from their jobs. CORE cost one person his annual holidays, and most participants complained bitterly about how the process took them away from their families and real jobs. For the highly compensated FMM's representative - a high-profile downtown corporate lawyer - this was his job. The greater sacrifice of some over others again indicates how uneven was the "level playing field." Linda Petch (Tourism) noted that CORE's financial policy built in "systemic discrimination from the start because you have the forest industry paying somebody by the hour, where in other sectors you have total volunteers" (Petch Tourism).

According to the Round Table document on consensus negotiations, adequate funding to ensure equal participation is a basic principle of shared decision-making, "alleviating financial hardship faced by such parties through
reimbursements is necessary to ensure equal participation and attention to all interests" (British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and the Economy Reaching Agreement 17).

Most sectors complained about running out of money and having to subsidize their representatives. Decisions about funding made by CORE staff seemed arbitrary. There was even a requirement that sectors had to raise funds themselves to send their representatives to CORE before CORE staff would consider funding requests. Some participants were furious; not only were they asked to volunteer their time to be involved in a process which they saw as letting the government off the hook, but they were also asked to donate further time to raise money for CORE participation. It was certainly a far cry from the government promise to fund participants:

While the participation of some parties may be supported by the stakeholders that they are representing (for instance, where participation is part of the job of government or corporate staff), others may actually be forced to take time away from their work at their own expense, and/or support their participation through personal funds. Alleviating financial hardship faced by such parties through reimbursements is necessary to ensure equal participation and attention to all interests (British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and the Economy Reaching Agreement 17).

Although Premier Harcourt and CORE Commissioner Stephen Owen did assure the public that funding would be provided to those who required it, representatives complained bitterly about the lack of equity in funding. Linda Petch (Tourism) felt very resentful when I saw the amount of money being spent on CORE staff and knowing that even though the Tourism Association of Vancouver Island had applied for $33,000, they only gave us $11,000. At the last meeting in Courtenay, all the government people were staying over at the
very nice Coast Hotel on the other side of Courtenay, and there I was sharing a room in this gawd-awful, cold hotel (Petch Tourism).

While the corporate Forestry sector had their own economic resources to rely on, the other sectors were not treated equally. There was enormous disparity in participant funding. Youth, Conservation, Forest Independents, Outdoor Recreation and the Social and Economic Sustainability Sector got the most resources and received $36,028.64, $47,015.59, $29,511.48, $38,197.72 and $40,835.96 respectively. Those familiar with funding applications made sure they applied for the maximum, and they received the maximum; while inexperienced participants such as Donna Gross (Fishery) applied only for minimal expenses of $14,677.64 with little appeal possible for an increased budget once she realized what funding was available to other sectors. The CORE staff could have taken a more proactive role in assisting participants in preparing budgets which would ensure equality of participation.

The unequal financial resources and unequal cultural capital, combined with the superior power base the forest companies had with their legal rights to the land base, meant that the "playing field" was indeed not equal. There is the further issue of whether consensus is possible among people with different paradigmatic worldviews, which will be taken up in the next chapter.

Chapter three footnotes

¹ As French cultural theorist Pierre Bourdieu comments: the whole truth of the communicative relation is never fully present in the discourse, nor even in the communicative relation itself; a genuine science of discourse must seek that truth within discourse but also outside
it, in the social conditions of the production and reproduction of the producers and receivers and of their relationship (Bourdieu 1977 650).

2 Bourdieu defines cultural capital as "the different sets of linguistic and cultural competencies that individuals inherit by way of the class-located boundaries of their family" (Bourdieu as quoted in Giroux 268).

3 Bourdieu would argue that the lack of representation of women at CORE, in combination with how some women were treated, would amount to censorship:

Language is not only an instrument of communication or even knowledge, but also an instrument of power. A person speaks not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished. Competence implies the power to impose reception... Among the most radical, surest, and best hidden censorships are those which exclude certain individuals from communication (e.g. by not inviting them to places where people speak with authority, or by putting them in places without speech) (Bourdieu 1977 648).

4 Bourdieu points out that linguistic competence - the ability to speak with credibility - is related to both the situation and to the authority of the speaker. He argues that:

linguistics - the ability to speak with credibility - is related to both the situations in which the speaker learned to speak, [and cannot] be separated from the social and economic conditions in which the discourse takes place. While most speakers can produce grammatically correct sentences, the test for competence is the ability to produce sentences judiciously and appropriately... when to speak, keep silent, speak in this way or that style (Bourdieu 1977 646).

5 Bourdieu explains:

at the basis of self-censorship is the sense of the acceptable... The system of selective reinforcements has constituted in each of us a sort of sense of linguistic usages which defines the degree of constraint that a given field brings to bear on our speech (so that, in a given situation, some will be reduced to silence, others to hyper-controlled language, whereas still others will feel able to use free, relaxed language) (Bourdieu 1977 655).
Chapter Four

The war in the woods: Is peace possible?

The problem of different world outlooks at the table

The mediation and consensus models for conflict resolution assume a degree of shared values and goals - certain common ground - among the participants. The consensus mediation model was not appropriate for CORE since the participants had fundamentally different paradigmatic views of nature and humans' relationship to it. Different paradigmatic views mean that a negotiation is possible but not consensus. Further, this shared decision-making process did not result in the participants significantly shifting their world views.

There is a material basis to the conflict between the loggers and environmentalists. On the one hand, logging companies want to maintain their land-tenure and loggers their standard of living; on the other hand, many urban environmentalists apparently don't worry about impacts of cut-backs on logging communities. There is also a conflict in values between the two sides. This chapter will examine the differing values in the context of differing world views. The concepts of paradigm and hegemony will be key here. Two questions will be addressed. Is consensus achievable when the participants in a negotiation think with fundamentally different paradigms? Did this negotiation process cause any participants to change, even slightly, their world views?
Although the terms hegemony, paradigm, and world outlook derive from different theoretical works, they describe similar phenomena. The term "world outlook" refers to an overall conception of the nature of the world and the underlying system of principles and values. ¹

The notion of "hegemony" was popularized by twentieth-century Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, who defined hegemony as the “spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group" (Gramsci 12). This notion includes the vital elements of power and domination, and that the 'power bloc' - the dominant class - maintains its position through alliances with other social sectors.

While there is hegemony or a prevailing world outlook in any society, Gramsci points out that an alternative world view may also arise and begin "to exercise its own hegemony over traditional culture" (Gramsci 462). As British cultural theorist, Raymond Williams says, since hegemony is continually resisted, limited, altered, [and] challenged by pressures not at all its own. We have then to add to the concept of hegemony the concepts of counter-hegemony and alternative hegemony, which are real and persistent elements of practice (Williams 1988 112-113).

Achieving and maintaining hegemony is a continuing process, dynamic and active. Hegemony faces ongoing pressures and limits and must be continually "renewed, recreated, defended, and modified" (Williams 1988 112).

According to Williams, not only is there an economic and political control exercised by the dominant class, but also exerted is a projection of a way of
viewing the world. This way of seeing the world includes a view of human relationships which are part of the natural order, as 'common sense', as "a whole body of practices and expectations, over the whole of living: our senses and assignments of energy, our shaping perceptions of ourselves and our world. It is a lived system of meanings and values" (Williams 1988 110).

This concept is useful in examining how people view their relationship with the environment. People consider their own views of nature and of humankind's relationship to the natural order as obvious, 'natural' and commonsensical. Given that today there is an alternative view of humans' relation to nature emerging, in a multi-stakeholder forum it is important to analyze the views towards nature held by different participants. Imagine that two people, with different views of the environment, see a tree. In fact, they see different things. One might see a resource to be harvested, the other, something with its own life force deserving protection. Such different viewpoints might explain why there are often such exasperated, dumbfounded and acrimonious interchanges between environmentalists and the forest industry, why, as British cultural theorist, Stephen Cotgrove asserts, "environmentalists and industrialists face each other uncomprehendingly, the blind talking to the deaf, each accusing the other of irrationality" (Cotgrove 26).

The essence of these differences can be examined with Williams' notion of the "structure of feeling" which is "a particular quality of social experience and relationship, historically distinct from other particular qualities which gives the sense of a generation or of a period" (Williams 1988 131). Williams chose the
term feeling to distinguish it from the more formal concepts of world view and
ideology:

For we find here a particular sense of life, a particular community of
experience hardly needing expression...it is the particular living result of all
the elements in the general organization...the culture of a period (Williams
1961 64-65).

Certainly in the last fifteen years the traditional vision of “man” as ruler and
exploiter of nature - which might be called the industrial world view - has been
challenged by an alternative hegemony, an environmentalist world view that
humanity is but one species in an entire natural order that must be protected.

The shift from an industrial to an environmental world view could be observed
at public hearings in Vancouver in July 1991 regarding logging in the Tsitika
watershed on Vancouver Island and its impact on the beaches of Johnstone
Straight frequented by killer whales (British Columbia July 4, 1991 Johnstone
Strait Killer Whale Committee Hearings n/p). The Tsitika watershed was one of
the 'hot spots' included in a logging moratorium while the Vancouver Island
CORE process worked out the regional land-use strategy for the area. In the
1991 hearings, forest company managers, loggers and Ministry of Forests
officials all agreed that the welfare of whales was a major concern for all
stakeholders, including themselves. This represented a significant shift from the
early 1970s when these same players, who formulated the logging plans for the
area, did not even mention the existence, let alone the right to exist, of whales
(British Columbia July 4, 1991 Johnstone Straight Killer Whale Committee
Hearings n/p).
Another framework for understanding the fundamentally different world views can be explored through the concept of paradigms. The term paradigm derives from T.S. Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Kuhn argued that empirical experiences or "facts" did not in themselves give rise to theories. Instead theoretical frameworks, or what Kuhn termed "paradigms" gave meaning and validity to facts. "Theories were comprehensive orderings of reality, in which the whole was in some sense prior to its parts and made sense of its individual components" (Kuhn quoted in Bullock 626). While Kuhn's definition of paradigm has faced criticism for its lack of specificity, the term itself has become rooted in contemporary debate and is used to describe particular world views.

Paradigms provide maps of what the world is believed to be like and constitute guidelines for identifying and solving problems. The conflict between paradigms involves many factors including an individual's or group's view of its relationship to nature, to economic factors, in particular, how one earns a living, and, following these factors, one's interests and social needs.

According to British theorist Stephen Cotgrove in his study of paradigms held by different groups, paradigms "provide the framework of meaning within which 'facts' and experiences acquire significance and can be interpreted", (Cotgrove 26) and "they have a normative as well as a cognitive dimension, indicating not only what is but what ought to be done" (Cotgrove 26).
Different paradigms operating among different participants

Different paradigms could be seen to be operating amongst the participants at the CORE table. What Cotgrove calls the "industrialist's" paradigm is close to what Gramsci and Williams would call the "dominant hegemony." This will be called the "dominant" paradigm throughout this thesis. It depends on authoritative structures and the influence of experts in decision-making. It favours hierarchy and centralized power. On the other hand, says Cotgrove, a non-hierarchical, decentralized, citizen-participation structure is typical of the environmentalist's paradigm. (Cotgrove 27). Cotgrove's paradigms could be seen operating at the CORE table; Paul Senez, a representative of the Conservation sector, says his group operated in "a non-hierarchical, non-patriarch-dominated, interest-based approach. We were a thirteen-member team that did not have a traditional hierarchical structure with spokesperson, steering committee, and second and third row. We were all it". Compare the view of the Conservation sector structure with that of the Forest Employment sector as outlined in its Statement of Accountability and Authority:

Our sector will have one spokesperson, as we believe that it is imperative to keep the number of representatives at the main table to a minimum in order for the negotiations to be successful. The spokesperson will have full authority as all issues will be dealt with through the steering committee (British Columbia CORE Vancouver Island Table Report Volume III Appendix n/p).

A greater difference in paradigms between the sectors was evident in attitudes toward nature. Mining and forest industry representatives expressed the view that nature exists primarily to create jobs and profits through resource
extraction and that “man” has dominion over a nature which has ample reserves for “man's” use. The Mining sector Interest Statement points out that “wherever viable mineral deposits are discovered, regulated mining is arguably the ‘highest and best use’ of our land”, and that “mining is a profit-motivated sector” which is also “the top wage payer in the country”. The FMM Interest Statement points out that wood is a “fully renewable resource,” that “old growth has an intrinsic commercial value greater than that of second growth,” and that “forest managers can speed up nature’s timetable for regeneration”.

Such a view reflects Cotgrove's notion of the dominant paradigm in which "the twin pillars of the enterprise culture [are] the moral imperative to “wealth” production, and the associated moral conviction of the right to dominate nature and to harness the natural environment to this end" (28). This view says that the domination over and domestication of nature is an improvement over the natural world. In their Interest statement, the Forest Managers and Manufacturers indicate that wood is to be used for products and that humans can do better than nature at maintaining forests:

We make an enormous range of useful things out of wood...there is an increasing demand for products ... Forest managers cannot adjust the weather but they can ensure that the soil retains its productivity by taking care to keep erosion to a minimum when building and maintaining roads, and by utilizing harvesting techniques such as clearcutting that help return to the soil natural nutrients and species that cannot survive under dense forest canopies (British Columbia CORE Vancouver Island Table Report Volume III Appendix n/p).
The paradigmatic debate about sustainability

The terms "sustainable" or "sustainability", terms used throughout CORE literature and discussion, are also problematic because they mean different things to different people. The term "sustainable development" was coined in the 1983 United Nation's report *Our Common Future*, also known as the *Brundtland Report*, after Gro Harlem Brundtland, head of the Commission that provided the research and recommendations for the report. This term originally reflected the notion that both economic and environmental factors had to be taken into consideration so that the needs of the present wouldn't compromise the needs of future generations. However, the very phrase, "sustainable development," represents both the dominant and oppositional views. If the emphasis is placed on the noun, "development," it represents sustained growth and the dominant, status-quo view, whereas placing the emphasis on the adjective, "sustainable," highlights conservation, ecology and limiting growth to sustain finite resources. This debate has led to the emergence and popularization of the term "sustainability," which is often described as a three-legged stool where environmental, economic and social factors have equal importance and where there is constant interplay between all aspects. However, the term "sustainability" is often used as a means to give higher priority to status-quo economic factors over environmental or ecological issues. We even hear terms such as "sustainable" profits. The Forest Managers and Manufacturers conclude in their *Interest Statement* that they wish to "assist the people of British Columbia in
understanding and supporting sustainable development of their forest resources. But they go on to explain that:

In order to sustain all of these values, the working forest must be large enough to accommodate many different kinds of users and uses. The more forest zoning and practices requirements effectively diminish production within the working forest, the wider the boundary of that forest will have to be to ensure the stability of the commercial operations that rely on it (British Columbia CORE Vancouver Island Table Report Volume III Appendix n/p).

They further clarify their understanding of the term by saying they hope "investments in B.C. forest Sector will be sustained and increased over time" (British Columbia CORE Vancouver Island Table Report Volume III Appendix n/p).

The industrialist world view also values large-scale and highly-ordered human activities and places its confidence in science, the market-place, and technology. In this view:

Technology is always good: accordingly firms must always expand; the consumption of goods is the principal source of happiness; idleness is wicked as an alternative to work, and finally nothing should interfere with the priority that we accord to technology, growth, and increased consumption (Cotgrove 88).

Dominating nature as part of the notion of being able to sustain development was a theme shared by both the Forest and Mining sectors. In the Mining Sector's Interest Statement, the two most important interests were "certainty of land tenure [and] access to as much land as possible for exploration".

The environmentalist paradigm was also represented at CORE. Cotgrove's study found that "the environmentalist regards the human species as being dependent upon, and responsible to, nature which has an intrinsic value, is
delicately balanced, and has limited resources. This view emphasizes global ecology, biological diversity, and genetic pools" (27). The Conservation sector started their Interest Statement with this quotation from ecologist, Aldo Leopold:

> We abuse land because we see it as a commodity belonging to us. When we begin to see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect (British Columbia CORE Vancouver Island Table Report Volume III Appendix n/p).

Cliff Stainsby (General Employment) also reflected the environmentalist paradigm:

> A paradigm shift for me would be a shift from consumer society to one that is truly sustainable, one that recognizes the relationship between consumption and environmental problems and really focuses its interest towards different kinds of activities consistent with survival, ecological principles and so on. I think it's quite clear that shift didn't happen [within the CORE process].

According to Stainsby and the environmentalist view, society faces a crisis because current levels of energy use and resource extraction are not sustainable. Extraction and production must be cut back drastically and "radical measures must be adopted immediately to save the planetary ecosystem and humanity" (British Columbia Task Force on Environment and Economy Sustaining the Living Land 15). In the environmentalist paradigm, human beings do not have a right to dominate nature; rather, as environmental activist Paul Watson puts it, "the earth becomes a more important entity than the human species. People are, in fact, just one citizen species among 30-million-plus other citizen species" (Quoted. by Tim Gallagher in British Columbia Report 1990 26). This view was also reflected in the Youth Sector Interest Statement, which was
written as a personal narrative, rather than in the impersonal, third-person format of the industrial sectors. It states, "I worry about all the things that we're losing each day. All the species ... because they have a right to live and to share the planet with us". The Conservation Sector Interest Statement also reflects these values saying, "All life has value in and of itself - independent of human activity, need, or convenience. We endeavor to speak with humility for that which cannot speak for itself".

Further paradigmatic differences were evident regarding views about global environmental concerns. While the Conservation sector said it was "committed to Canada's global responsibility and international commitments to protect, conserve and enhance our natural environment," (Conservation Interest Statement), the Forest Managers and Manufacturers wanted to "remain competitive as to quality, cost and reliability and (to provide) products responsive to customer demands in the competitive global marketplace" (Forest Managers and Manufacturers' Interest Statement).

Can consensus be reached among participants with different paradigmatic views?

Given that participants arrived at the CORE table with different world outlooks and values, could consensus be reached? Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary provides two meanings for "consensus": "group solidarity in sentiment and belief" and "the judgment arrived at by most concerned" (Websters 238). The first
meaning is commonly used in collegial decision-making where the participants have similar backgrounds, share similar values and views, and work jointly on a given project. The CORE Youth Sector felt that it operated according to this principle: "Within our own group, we always used true interest-based consensus and we always came up with really good results, but the fundamental difference is that we all had a common purpose and fairly well-shared values" (Parker Youth).

"Consensus" is also used in the second sense to mean majority decision making by a group which, regardless of differences, is expected to reach consensus on a decision that participants feel they can live with.

The Youth sector statement described a situation where consensus could be arrived at among people who shared common values, interests and goals. This does not describe the mixed group at the Vancouver Island CORE table which represented the full range of commercial, environmental and social interests.

How did the participants themselves perceive the "shared-ness" of their values and interests? To Linda Petch (Tourism), whose perspective from the tourist industry placed her between Forestry and Conservation, the values of CORE participants were so far apart that reconciliation was impossible:

A value system is something that guides your principles and the way that you live your life, and a world view is something that you act on consistently. So if you value the environment you act on that consistently, compared to the value system coming from the forestry majors which basically values money.
Les Carter (Outdoor Recreation), who represented another sector whose values placed them between Forestry and Conservation, explained that in order to build bridges between the two positions, there needed to be a modicum of shared interests and a common goal.

but when you run into a situation where one of the negotiators is a Christian and the other is a lion, the lion says “my interest is in eating you” and the Christian says “my interest is in staying alive.” then you have to go a long ways out into generalizations before you find any common ground. So somewhere there has to be that precondition of some sort of common interest. That's where companies get in trouble with the process.

Several sectors shared the perception that the forest industry and many of the other sectors would not agree on common values. As Zane Parker (Youth) explained:

Our sector initiated the Vision statement because we thought that if the table couldn't even agree on basic values that we shared, what hope was there on reaching consensus on land-use planning... everyone got into it...Except the forest industry came back with this garbage about global competitiveness and tried to scuttle the whole thing. So we realized early on that we probably couldn't accomplish much in finding a common vision.

Irreconcilable differences in values between the forest and mining industries and other sectors created a significant paradox at CORE. Since the original fight was perceived to be between the multinationals and the conservationists, they both had to be at the table. However, since they held fundamentally different values and intentions, it turned out to be impossible for them to arrive at consensus.

The result of these tensions was that instead of a consensual “win-win” outcome, a “no-win” situation became inevitable. Cliff Stainsby (General
Towards the middle of the process, it became clear that some sectors, such as the Forest Managers and Manufacturers, had no interest in consensus, did not think that consensus was possible... they just wanted to say that they had tried.

Facing such a clash between the values of industrial and environmental interests, the designers of CORE should have been more realistic in their objectives. They should have analyzed the situation to determine if the participants shared enough values and goals to enable consensus to emerge. If this condition could not be met, then CORE should have been structured differently so that participants would enter the process prepared to engage in strategic negotiations.

Do values shift as a result of participation in multi-stakeholder processes?

However, even though consensus might not have been possible given the different paradigms, perhaps one beneficial aspect of the discussion was the opportunity for the sectors to learn more about each other's views. According to Round-Table process theory, when participants from different backgrounds are brought together for formal, regular face-to-face meetings, informal communication opportunities allow everyone to see the personal side of those who might normally be known to them only one-dimensionally as opponents. These personal insights are supposed to lead to greater understanding and
create opportunities to find common ground upon which to resolve differences
(Interview Bob Nixon June 4, 1993). To a limited degree, greater personal understanding did occur within the CORE process, but there are indications that distrust and dislike may have deepened too. Delores Broten observed that

In fact, if anything, I think the pulp workers' unions went backwards, went more to the companies' camp under pressure. The union people who normally relate to the issues I work on were afraid to demonstrate any solidarity with me because there was so much pressure from the IWA to start with and also the forest industry, the corporations. There was a social context that was set up where union people who were normally friendly with me were not able to be friendly with me. That's the opposite of what we were trying to do actually.

Kim Pollock would concur with Broten that the gulf between sectors was extended as a result of this process:

The biggest gulf for me was trying to understand what the conservation sector people were about. And with some of them I came to understand them better I think. But with a lot them I just lost it because it became pretty clear to me that they could not give a fuck about working people at all.

And Delores Broten (Fishery) further reflected on the artificiality in the notion that a formalized, facilitated government-sponsored CORE process was necessary to help people discuss issues:

I maintain that we really shouldn't need this kind of process to have a decent social life where we talk to each other. I find it kind of surprising that we need this kind of formal process to find out that other people are real.

This comment disputes the notion that a government-mandated process necessarily facilitates communication.
However, while some participants felt that the CORE process negatively affected their relationships with members from other sectors, some felt that the process facilitated a positive interaction. As Brian Currie said, "quite frankly you gain a certain respect for the passion and commitment of these people". And Bruce McKnight (Mining) reflected that "this coming together, just because of the greater familiarity, getting to know one another much better, was a positive thing." However, he added "I'm not sure that it resulted in any major change in people's thinking or any shift in people's values".

The issue of paradigm shifts and how they occurred was a communication issue I wanted to study through this process. I wanted to explore what types of communication might enable paradigm shifts to occur, and if we are able to describe the causes of paradigm shifts, then can we stimulate those factors to accelerate a paradigm shift toward habitat protection and social justice for displaced workers?

As I discussed these issues with the participants, I found that some participants had joined the CORE table with the intention of changing the world views of the other participants. Bob Nixon, a forester, editor of Forest Planning Canada and member of the Forest Independents Sector said that his intention in participating in the CORE process was "to assist the paradigm shift toward the government making decisions differently so that there would be a fundamental reform of our governmental decision-making" (Interview June 4, 1993). While Nixon was trying to change the paradigmatic basis for the process of governmental decision-making, Lloyd Manchester, a participant in the
Conservation Sector, said that his participation in CORE was "less to achieve a specific goal and more to provide a point of view which would cause a paradigm shift" toward greater environmental values (Interview February 8, 1994).

On the other hand, Heather Pate (Social and Economic Sustainability Sector) explained that she did not come to the CORE process to change her own views and further, that she resented having people pushing her to change her philosophy when she came to the table to undertake a specific task:

I was there to solve a practical problem. I wasn't there to change anyone's world view. If CORE was there to discuss philosophy, I probably wouldn't go because I grew my philosophy over time and it can change, but I'm not involved in a negotiation to change that; it will be my personal experience that will change that.

Some participants felt that the experiences at the table were a long way from a paradigm shift. Cliff Stainsby (General Employment) believed that there was little or no real engagement on value issues, and further, that most of the parties arrived at the table with entrenched positions, which meant that CORE was not a forum for openness or for exploring positions which might lead to change:

the position [the companies] put forward was one to enhance their status quo position. I understand the Share groups and see their fears and interests as legitimate, but I don't think they were ever free to explore new ideas about sustainability and so on since they are so much under the thumbs of the large companies who control them.

Zane Parker (Youth) reiterated Stainsby's skepticism about the opportunity to change people's world outlooks through involvement in multi-stakeholder processes, but he ended with a note of optimism:

One of the best things for us was reading our interest statements, which we did really dramatically, and people were very moved by our statement. They could see their own children in us, but we always felt that they could
never act on that because they were always stuck in these little positions of defending their interests, ... but you never know down the road as these things sink in and become more apparent that the seeds of change might have been planted, but it wasn't a paradigm shift.

In order for a consensual agreement to occur, parties must share values, goals and be willing to honestly work out an agreement acceptable to all. In the Vancouver Island CORE process, these conditions were not present. When participants enter into a multi-stakeholder process, it is important for them to evaluate the degree to which these conditions are present so that they can act accordingly. If there is not enough common ground and shared goals for consensus, then participants must recognize that they are involved in a strategic negotiation and proceed from that basis.

Finally, while the potential exists in a multi-stakeholder process for participants to learn about each others’ values and interests, a negotiating situation is not the forum for influencing changes in world outlooks. In fact such a forum, because the objectives of the different groups are so critical, may result in an entrenchment rather than an opening to change values and goals.

Chapter four footnotes

1 The German word for ‘world-outlook’ is weltanschauung and refers to a “general conception of the nature of the world, particularly as containing or implying a system of value-principles” (Bullock et al 1988 905).
Chapter Five

Conclusion

Should citizens participate: Containment or true decision making?

Since individuals and organizations from all walks of life increasingly face the decision of whether or not to participate in multi-stakeholder consensus processes, this thesis has implications beyond the land-use debate. Given the possible squandering of their limited resources, personnel and time, citizen groups have to think deeply before jumping into consensus negotiations. This study concludes that most consensus negotiations, and in particular the Vancouver Island CORE process, contain debate and dissension rather than contributing to conflict resolution. The main question has been: does this type of forum have potential for resolving contentious issues or is it little more than a containment exercise? As Britell points out:

Land management agencies are making concerted efforts to undercut opposition to unpopular logging plans by getting the public more involved in planning. Agency managers have learned the value of the appearance of ‘public’ approval and how easy it is to get. Timber-plagued politicians are learning too, that negotiating groups are a media-friendly way to duck difficult decisions (19).

Given the dangers of being contained and manipulated, the first decision participants have to make is whether or not conditions are present to allow some
progress to be made, and if those conditions are not present then to recognize a futile containment exercise for what it is.

First, they must determine if planning decisions are being made outside the group process or if the real decision-makers are part of the process. Britell has observed that:

Citizen’s work groups are, almost without exception, negotiating sessions of a peculiar type: they are “negotiations with agents with limited authority.” Negotiations of this kind present the problem that if you make concessions they are gone forever, but any gains you make can be overturned by higher authorities (21).

The participants need to assess who is making decisions on the issues discussed - politicians or bureaucrats, and whether the decision-makers will participate in the process. This is important in order to decide how best to influence the decision-maker and to assess whether the process will even result in decisions being made. In the case of CORE, the decision-makers were not at the table, although Commissioner Stephen Owen frequented meetings and received reports from his staff. Since no agreement was reached at the table, Owen wrote his own report and passed his recommendations to cabinet. Following release of his report, there were intensive mass rallies, lobbying and media coverage which no doubt greatly influenced the decisions made by cabinet. Many CORE participants would echo this warning from Britell after their involvement in the CORE process, “Be alert for ‘negotiations’ which just run out the clock. By the time you realize your efforts are futile, you may have wasted the time you could have used to mobilize public opinion” (21). As Linda
Petch (Tourism) said:

Now that this CORE process is over, you should get out there and lobby like hell. You can believe that Conservation will be out there lobbying, the majors are going to be leaning on the Forestry doors, so we better get out there and lobby the government and the public for all of the things that we wanted in CORE. Even after all the time that we have spent in this process, we still have to do what we were doing in the first place, which is lobbying and public education. We could have saved ourselves thousands of hours and the government a couple of million dollars.

Her comments reflect the recognition of many participants that CORE was not the essential forum for influencing key decision-makers, but rather that key decision-makers were profoundly influenced through lobbying and media work outside the process.

**The myths of equality and conflict resolution**

While my practical experience and academic study have convinced me that participation in a multi-stakeholder forum is far down on the list of effective activities for achieving a goal, such fora will continue to be part of political life. Given that citizens must deal with these fora, the myths of equality and conflict resolution surrounding multi-stakeholder consensus negotiations must be unmasked so that citizens can uncover the ingredients necessary for a better, more inclusive shared decision-making process which deals with contentious issues in our society.

The purpose for instituting the Commission on Resources and the Environment was to resolve the acrimonious war in the woods over logging-
related land-use issues. From my perspective after interviewing participants, as a conflict resolution process, CORE was not successful. Rather than provide a forum for authentic communication involving a rigorous discussion about the substantive issues, CORE contained debate. Before CORE there had been various grassroots initiatives by people involved in land-use issues. These initiatives had utilized a self-governed process to find common ground and solutions. However, the provincial government appropriated this budding citizen initiative and funneled land-use debate into a formal process with a pre-set agenda and a predetermined stakeholder structure that contained dissent and undermined the public's opportunity to engage in the forum. Not only did the structure and discursive style of the process serve to contain rather than encourage discussion, many of the participants arrived at the table with the strategic intention of maintaining their positions rather than engaging in communicative action toward conflict resolution. Further, CORE claimed the participants would be equal, but the "playing field" was not "level". First were the enormous imbalances in power, resources and cultural capital. Further, there was an inadequate response on the part of the process builders to ameliorate these differences because of the way the sectors were treated at the table and the differing amounts of intervenor funding they received. These problems must be addressed and corrected in future processes.
The process must be self-governed

There are a number of conclusions that arise out of this study of the CORE process. The first conclusion is that the potential value of the process corresponds to the degree to which the process is self-governed. The grassroots-initiated coalition through the South Island Accord, a community-initiated and self-governing process, was overshadowed by the government-initiated CORE. While we can only speculate as to whether the groups involved in the Jobs and Environment Peace in the Woods committee might have been able to resolve the land-use conflicts, at least it was a hopeful citizen-based forum to address the issues. As Jack Nichol, United Fishermen and Allied Workers' participant in that committee said, "There has to be a dialogue between users to bring about a rational and intelligent use of our lands, our forests and waterways" (The Fisherman October 22, 1992). Direct, frank discussion from community stakeholders is essential. This dialogue was aimed at recognizing common interests as well as at finding ways to accommodate different user groups' needs. Instead, the government appropriated this type of coalition forum and instituted the CORE process. The government cannot be the instrumental party setting up the process.

Finally, CORE violated a number of aspects of self-governance by pre-setting the agenda, predetermining the structure of the forum, and not treating all participants as equal.
A pre-set agenda and structure

Prior to the process even starting, it had been determined by the CORE staff that the multi-national forest companies would be included at the table and that the Crown land-tenure system and logging practices were off-limits for discussion. The profound power imbalance stemming from the companies' rights to the land undermined any potential for equality in the process. When critical questions such as these are determined outside of the process, the process is not a self-governed one. Further, the structure - that it would be an interest-based multi-sectoral forum - had been predetermined with no consultation whatsoever from those who would be involved.

The CORE staff actively invited and assisted the participation of some sectors, while other sectors had to struggle to get a seat at the table. The "brown" and the "green" sectors, namely the Forest Managers and Manufacturers, Mining, Forest Employment and Forest Independents and the Conservation sector were invited to the table at the very beginning of the process and their participation was actively supported by the CORE staff (Pollock Forest Employment, Jeffery Forest Independents, Senez Conservation). On the other hand, the Fishery and Social and Economic Sustainability sectors were given little encouragement to be involved. As Britell points out: "manipulation of citizen's committees begins with the selection of participants" (21) and the perception was that CORE staff rallied some sectors more than others (Gross Fishery). The combination of these three factors, the pre-set agenda, the
predetermined structure, and the preferential treatment given to some sectors at the table meant that many potential participants withdrew, thus limiting the inclusiveness of the process. It also meant that full debate of issues of concern was restricted. Citizens who are invited to engage in a forum in which the parameters have already been firmly set should be skeptical about the potential for future self-governance in the process. Further, any group engaged in a multi-sectoral forum must closely analyze if their participation is considered by the process managers as essential to the process. This analysis will provide strategic information about how to engage in the forum. The group might also decide to withdraw if the main reason for their involvement is to provide legitimacy and a backdrop to what is essentially a two-party negotiation.

Equality issues must be addressed

Not only did the predetermined sectoral structure of the process dictate how participants would communicate within their sector and at the table, but all sectors were not given equal authority to participate in the debate. The land-use conflict has been framed as essentially between logging and environmental interests and the CORE process mediators did not ensure that all interests were treated equally at the table. An important factor for organizations or individuals to consider before becoming involved in a multi-stakeholder process is whether or not their participation is considered to be central to resolution of the conflict or whether they are included for the disingenuous purpose of making the process
look inclusive. If an interest group is being used as a backdrop for a two-party debate, then the efficacy of participating is highly questionable.

The gender imbalance at CORE raises questions about how accommodating and inclusive the process was for women. The monthly two-to-three-day meetings away from home made it very difficult for women with families, women who in this society are still primary caregivers. The discursive style of the proceedings may have also contributed to this underrepresentation, but that is a topic for further investigation. The disproportionate male presence at the table may have been because "most decision-makers in society are male, and that's a reality, the table reflected society in that way" (Stainsby General Employment).

**The mythology of the “level playing field”**

The assumptions inherent in the notion of a round table consensus process creating a "level playing field" must be addressed. There are two main components in this myth. The first is that people with vastly disparate power bases, resources and cultural capital will become equals because "for a defined period of time on the issues that the participants have agreed to address, they participate as equals" (British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and the Economy *Reaching Agreement* 4). While no process can assume responsibility for creating equality, to ignore inequities in power, resources, cultural capital and financial support is to ensure that disparities will affect the
final outcome of the process. As Zane Parker (Youth) said:

The problem with the consensus process is that usually it's the vested interests which have the most power and the most ability to participate, so inevitably their views tend to dominate and the status-quo tends to be perpetuated.

Rather than being lulled into some degree of misguided confidence that they are being treated equally, it is important that people who are engaged in consensus negotiations critically evaluate the strengths and resources of the other participants against their own strengths in order to maximize their own effectiveness.

The second falsehood in the "level playing field" mythology is that fundamentally opposing views can be accommodated. Even if all parties were somehow treated equally, there is the inherent contradiction in consensus negotiations that fundamentally opposed views can agree on the substantive issues. Both consensus negotiations and the mediation model assume that the participants have common values and goals. Mediation can work in family or neighbourhood disputes - situations where participants usually share common values, world outlooks and where all the players fundamentally want to solve the conflict to maintain the relationship. Once the hope of common ground and common goalsvanishes then the consensus or mediation process will dissolve. The consensus process then becomes a strategic negotiation, and many people involved in CORE indicated that they felt participants were engaged in strategic rather than communicative action throughout the process. It is essential that people engaged in any multi-stakeholder process assess whether the discussion
is one aimed at communicative action and mutual problem solving or if it is a hardball strategic negotiation. If it is the latter, then the participants must have the skills necessary to operate effectively in such a forum, and organizations should send representatives with these negotiation skills.

**Engagement in substantive debate - not containment**

Another reason why Vancouver Island CORE was not a successful conflict resolution model is because debate about substantive issues was contained. Most participants agreed that the deliberations were "too process-oriented" at the expense of forthright engagement in the contentious issues. The pre-set agenda, predetermined structure and lack of equality among participants certainly contributed to this containment and may have pre-ordained the ultimate failure of the outcome. The communication style of the process managers was also a key factor in the table not grappling with and resolving the quarrelsome issues. As Britell points out, "through processes too complex to relate here, managers or facilitators choreograph meetings so that peer-group pressure smothers substance" (21). The government-set deadlines also contributed to the table's inability to work through areas of disagreement. It is essential that participants can actively engage in discussion of differences between them if conflict resolution is to occur, and that participants assess and set their own realistic time-line for completion of the tasks.
The role of the public was lost

The public must throw its support behind recommendations about land-use, and that was not possible in the case of Vancouver Island CORE because the public at large was not involved. The interest-based sectoral structure of the multi-stakeholder forum precluded the general public's involvement, and little was done by the CORE staff to even inform the public of the discussions as they were proceeding. The CORE table's Policy and Procedure Agreement permitted the media to observe the meetings, but there was no proactive initiation on the part of CORE to reach out and involve the non-aligned public through the media or any other forum. Sectors were expected to communicate with their constituencies but the fact that sectors were loosely defined coalitions that had never worked together before and were operating on extremely limited resources often meant inadequate communication. Many groups were putting all their efforts into their involvement at the table leaving little time and energy to communicate to people outside of the process. This is another reason why the lack of adequate intervenor funding seriously compromised the outcome.

Further, not one of the CORE staff had a communications or media background. They were all resource managers, planners or lawyers. This again indicates the predetermination of the texture of the process by the CORE staff. It is positive that CORE did not undertake a manipulative communication strategy which could have put a falsely optimistic "spin" on the proceedings; nevertheless, a communications program could have been useful in bringing the public more
into the process. Regular contact with the public through local newspapers and cablevision could have given people the opportunity to be informed about what was being debated and who the representatives were. This might have even motivated some to enter into the discussions through a sector. And had there been some effort to engage the major media in covering the process, there might have been wider debate and greater public acceptance of the recommendations. However since the public was not involved in the process, there was little understanding or political will built to support recommendations flowing from the deliberations. The result was each sector taking their viewpoint to the public and politicians through media events after the table dissolved. The war in the woods through the media is still thriving. Through this study and related work experience, my conclusion is that media coverage and polling results are still the most compelling source of advice for government.

**Participation to enhance future credibility and build a stronger campaign**

Rarely in a consensus negotiation will the conditions which promise a successful outcome as discussed above occur. However, sometimes a group may choose to participate in a multi-stakeholder process because they have other goals to achieve. A group may decide that participation in a process is
necessary to enhance the group's credibility or to build up a public record.

Britell's experience has shown him that

negotiations present opportunities to build administrative records that agencies and judges cannot ignore. Some negotiations make available internal agency documentation which would otherwise be very difficult to obtain, and which can become the basis for lawsuits (23).

In terms of building credibility, Zane Parker (Youth) pointed out:

I do think there needs to be people engaged in these types of activities. For youth, when there's young people getting arrested in Clayoquot, we'll be able to say we did participate in negotiating processes, so our participation in this will support our other activities.

Engage in strategic negotiations

If citizens do decide to participate in a multi-stakeholder process, then they can achieve the best results if they follow a disciplined course of action. They must utilize experienced negotiators, develop strategic goals, and make alliances to meet those goals. They need to continually assess their own and other participants' strengths and weaknesses. As Britell says:

Too often, grassroots activists are emerging from advisory boards and work groups without even their slingshots intact. It doesn't have to be so. A clearer understanding of the nature of these negotiations, and careful attention to principles and details, can cut the odds environmentalists face in negotiations with land management agencies and extractive industry (19).

This thesis argues that multi-stakeholder negotiations are risky, and the results they produce must be carefully and constantly weighed against the time and effort expended to achieve those results. Participants can increase the
chances that their participation will net positive results in a number of ways. They should keep the process managers to task; establish clear, task-oriented agendas; determine who the bureaucratic and political decision-makers are and insist they attend the meetings. They should not allow time to be wasted on endless presentations and process items. They should ensure that official minutes are kept of meetings and the minutes must be signed by participants who agree with their content and tone. They should make sure specific issues are addressed and non-bureaucratic language is used. They should make sure specific individuals are accountable for undertaking specific tasks between meetings. Finally, they should create opportunities to have scientific evidence which supports their positions written into the official minutes.

Raising public awareness, mobilizing, grassroots organizing, directly lobbying government and undertaking media work produce longer lasting results than participating in consensus negotiations because the politicians make decisions based on what is going to get them elected again, and that is public opinion. As Al Huddleston said,

the elected officials, particularly those on the government side of the house, and certainly cabinet, the key committees in cabinet making the hard decisions, are the ones that have to be made aware of what is going on and what the people's concerns are and they have to be expected to respond, and if they do not, I guess their tenure in government is in jeopardy. I'm not talking about three or four people writing or faxing here. I'm talking about a massive movement here. And having been involved in, albeit local politics for some time, I know the value of hearing from people. There's nothing like a whole bunch of phone calls or letters or people screeching into your driveway to get your attention.
This thesis illustrates the point that the dominant interests stand the most to gain when a process is framed as consensus. And the ultimate conclusion of this analysis is that it is more useful for interest groups to continue to do their educating and advocating through the public forums of community activities and the media than it is for them to funnel their time and energy into multi-stakeholder processes such as CORE, which only contain debate.

Cultural struggle takes place in the public forums, and as Todd Gitlin comments:

This is the dialectic of cultural struggle. In our times, it goes on continuously, in the complex lines of resistance and acceptance, refusal and capitulation, which makes the field of culture a sort of constant battlefield. A battlefield where no once-for-all victories are obtained but where there are always strategic positions to be won and lost (Gitlin quoted in Hall 233).

The war in the woods is still with us; it is a war which is only the surface manifestation of a deeper cultural struggle.
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List Of Sector Interviewees

Following is a list of the sector participants starting with the sectors receiving the greatest amount of money from CORE. The brackets indicate how the sectors were cited in the thesis.

**Conservation - Paul Senez** - Interview February 8, 1994 (Senez Conservation).

**Social and Economic Sustainability (SESS) - Heather Pate** - Interview February 14, 1994 (Pate Social and Economic Sustainability Sector or Social and Economic Sustainability or SESS).


**Youth - Zane Parker** - Interview January 31, 1994 (Parker Youth).


**Forest Independents - Rick Jeffery** - Interview February 8, 1994 (Jeffery Forest Independents).


**Fishery - Donna Gross** - Interview February 9, 1994 (Fishery Gross).

**Mining - Bruce McKnight** - Interview February 24, 1994 (McKnight Mining).

**Agriculture/Aquaculture - Brian Currie** - Interview February 9, 1994 (Currie Agriculture).


**Forest Managers and Manufacturers - Bill Dumont** - Interview March 17, 1994 (Dumont Forest Managers and Manufacturers or FMM).
APPENDICES
Questions to participants and observers of the Vancouver Island CORE process.

Give specific examples with dates and locations as often as possible.

1. Your name, the "interest group" or "sector" you would describe yourself as coming from. How did your sector come together to get a seat at the table?

2. Describe your involvement with the CORE process. Did you do this as part of your job or as a volunteer? Was your sector able to provide the financial support necessary for you to participate in this process?

3. What were your expectations when you came to the table?
   What kind of process did you think you were involved in?

4. Do you have an example of the CORE process breaking down?
   Do you believe that consensus is possible given the different interests represented at the table?
   Do you think that the formalized communication in the CORE meetings helped or hindered consensus decision-making?

5. Comment on the physical set-up of the CORE meetings where everyone sat in their sectors behind their speaker? How do you think that physical arrangement affected the overall decision-making?
6. Comment on the apparent gender imbalance at the table where the majority of spokespersons were male.

7. Describe your view of the role and performance of the facilitator (Sloan) at the VI CORE process.

8. Describe what you think was going on during the January 6/94 conference call regarding wording on p.24 of the final report.

9. Do you see the CORE process as contributing to a paradigm shift? Do you think the sectors changed their world views on any issues? Do you see consensus based negotiation as a decision-making process which represents the wave of the future?

10. Why did the government institute this process? In your view, did the process work as the government wanted it to?

11. What two or three recommendation would you make to improve on this type of decision-making process?
12. Grassroot organizations with limited resources have to make decisions about what activities to engage in: lobbying government, public education, demonstrations, to name a few.

In which category would you put CORE?

Relative to the other available activities, how would you rate participation in CORE in terms of it being an effective and productive forum for groups to advocate for their interests?
A crisis in our forests is causing intense and unacceptable land use conflicts. Decades of government and industry mismanagement, overcutting and environmental degradation have seriously depleted both employment opportunities and the original old growth forests.

Wilderness preservation is not the greatest threat to forest industry jobs. However, preservation could worsen an already bleak situation unless drastic changes are made now.

Consequently, IWA Canada Local 1-80 CLC, the Carmanah Forestry Society, the Environmental Youth Alliance (South Vancouver Island); the Friends of Carmanah/Walbran, the Sierra Club of Western Canada and the Western Canada Wilderness Committee hereby publicly declare our common ground and unity of purpose in demanding the following changes in the management and stewardship of British Columbia's forest heritage:

1. Some old growth forest ecosystems must be protected in perpetuity to maintain the health of the biosphere.

   In order to determine how much should be set aside on South Vancouver Island, we urgently require:

   a) a complete socio/biophysical inventory of all forest lands; and,

   b) job creation strategies which utilize the untapped possibilities within the forest industry to offset potential job loss arising from the protection of additional areas.

   When the foregoing conditions have been met, we can then jointly seek the protection of additional areas.

2. The purpose of harvesting the forest is to promote and enhance long term community stability through the creation of jobs.

   We must create more jobs per cubic meter of wood. New jobs can be created through better use of the forest resource. Better forest uses include: value added manufacturing; environmentally appropriate logging systems; commercial thinning; intensive silviculture; land and habitat restoration; old growth forest research and ecotourism.

   All exports of raw logs and cants must be immediately stopped.
3. Government forest policy must be changed to ensure that decisions are no longer made without the active and authoritative participation in all levels of planning by all concerned.

Local control must be balanced with the Provincial public interest. Informed communication and accountability by all concerned is essential.

Decisions with negative impacts on workers and communities must be accompanied by economic development strategies to offset those impacts.

4. Some logging practices must be changed to protect all forest functions including in particular: wildlife and fisheries habitat; river systems; biodiversity and soil productivity. Such changes must ensure a safe working environment.

5. Outstanding Native land claims must be fairly and expeditiously resolved.

The foregoing changes cannot result without the strength of legislation and a forest service of sufficient size to monitor and enforce that legislation.

This accord is a first step in an ongoing dialogue regarding matters of mutual concern. The parties are committed to working together for constructive change.

Executed this 6th day September, 1991.

IWA Canada Local 1-80 CLC per:

Carmanah Forestry Society per:

Environmental Youth Alliance (South Vancouver Island) per:

Friends of Carmanah/Walbran per:

Sierra Club of Western Canada per:

Western Canada Wilderness Committee per:
A LAND USE CHARTER

THE PROVINCIAL COMMITMENT

The Government of British Columbia is committed to:

- protecting and restoring the quality and integrity of the environment, and
- securing a sound and prosperous economy

for present and future generations.

This commitment is made to the people of British Columbia and to the global community. A healthy environment and a healthy economy are essential to the social, cultural, material, physical and spiritual well-being of British Columbians. Furthermore, the Province recognizes its obligation to protect, manage and use its resources and environment to fulfill its responsibility to global well-being. Finally, the Province shall ensure that present-day decisions do not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own environmental and economic needs.

PRINCIPLES

SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

A healthy environment is the foundation upon which a sound economy and society depend. The essential role that ecosystems play in supporting our society establishes an environmental imperative that must be respected in all land, resource, and economic decisions. Our priority must be to maintain natural systems for present and future generations.

1. The Province shall maintain and enhance the life-supporting capacity of air, water, land and ecosystems. The Province shall respect the integrity of natural systems, and will seek to restore previously degraded environments.

2. The Province shall conserve biological diversity in genes, species and ecosystems.

3. The Province shall attempt to anticipate and prevent adverse environmental impacts. When making land and resource decisions, the Province shall exercise caution and special concern for natural values, recognizing that human understanding of nature is incomplete.

4. The Province shall ensure that environmental and social costs are accounted for in land, resource use and economic decisions.
5. The Province shall recognize its responsibility to protect the global environment, to reduce consumption to sustainable levels, to avoid importing or exporting ecological stresses, and to help meet the global challenge of sustainably supporting the human population.

6. The Province shall protect the environment for human uses and enjoyment, and will also respect the intrinsic value of nature.

Sustainable Economy

Our ability to sustain a quality environment depends upon our ability to foster a strong and sustainable economy. Such an economy is more efficient, and derives greater social benefits from the use of fewer environmental assets. In addition, a sustainable economy can provide the means for increased environmental protection and conservation, while offering society alternatives to undue exploitation of natural resources.

1. The Province shall promote a dynamic and competitive economy that maintains options for future land and resource uses.

2. The Province shall encourage diversified economic development that increases the employment and other benefits derived from a given stock of resources.

3. The Province shall encourage development that reduces waste and makes efficient use of resources.

4. The Province shall encourage optimum use of natural systems and resources, consistent with their inherent capability to support our economic, social and environmental needs.

5. The Province shall ensure that renewable resources are used in a manner that is sustainable over the long term.

6. The Province shall ensure that the use of non-renewable resources avoids their exhaustion, and addresses the needs of future generations.

7. The Province shall stimulate environmentally sound economic activity and innovation through a system of economic instruments.

8. The Province shall provide a regulatory framework which promotes stability and predictability for business and investment.
Social Sustainability

Social equity requires that the concerns of individuals and communities are respected as environmental and economic needs are balanced.

1. The Province shall aim for a fair distribution of the costs and benefits of land use decisions.

2. The Province is committed to social stability, and will support economic and social measures to address the economic effects of land use decisions.

3. The Province shall promote a good quality of life by fostering opportunities to:
   - earn a living;
   - obtain education and training;
   - access social, cultural and recreational services; and
   - enjoy a quality environment.

4. In addition, equity requires that land use and related resource and environmental decisions be made in a fair and open manner.

Decision-Making Processes

These environmental, economic and social principles shall be implemented and reconciled in neutrally administered decision-making processes that are open to the participation of all interests. The processes shall promote decision-making through the building of consensus amongst diverse perspectives and stakeholders.

1. The processes used for making decisions regarding land, resource and environment use must be:
   - Comprehensive and Integrated — Land use planning and management shall be cross-sectoral, comprehensive and integrated. The processes will address the full range of environmental, social and economic concerns and values.
   - Fair — The processes will adhere to the principles of administrative fairness, and shall provide full public access to relevant information.
A LAND USE CHARTER (CONT'D)

> Efficient and Effective — The processes will strive for efficient use of time and financial resources. Decision-making will be based on adequate information and assessment, so that wise and effective decisions can be made. The processes should effectively implement the principles of a sustainable society.

> Accountable — Decision-makers must be accountable to all participants in the processes, as well as to the broader public. Lines of accountability should be established for participants in decision-making who represent others. Overall, the processes must be responsive to community aspirations while maintaining consistency with provincial principles, goals and policies.

> Enforceable — The decisions made must be properly monitored and enforced.

> Adaptive and Flexible — The processes shall be capable of modifying decisions in response to technological innovations, field experience, shifts in social preferences, and new information. These modifications will be made in a manner that maintains social, environmental and economic stability.

> Respectful — The processes shall encourage respect for the diverse values, traditions, and aspirations of British Columbians and their communities.

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

Aboriginal title and the inherent rights of Aboriginal peoples to self government are recognized.

Land use decision-making shall incorporate, support and not interfere with negotiations on Aboriginal self government and treaties. Aboriginal peoples shall be encouraged to be active participants in decision-making.

SHARED RESPONSIBILITY

Achieving a sustainable society is everyone's responsibility — from individuals, businesses, and non-government organizations, to all levels of government, Aboriginal peoples, and the global community. The Province shall encourage all parties to protect the environment and build a sustainable economy. Our success depends upon the independent and cooperative initiatives of all British Columbians.
APPENDIX ONE

STATEMENTS OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY
AGRICULTURE SECTOR
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

Agriculture is a renewable resource based industry with the ability to produce a harvestable crop every year and sometimes several times per year. Over the recessions of the early 80's and 90's it was the only BC resource industry to maintain its gross domestic product and increased the number of people it employs both directly and indirectly, and continues to be one of the highest employment spin-off generators and has tremendous potential to increase employment opportunities from further value-added manufacturing and processing. Vancouver Island farmers are among the most productive and efficient in the world in their commodities.

The Agriculture Land Reserve was originally intended to protect all farm land in BC from alienation and any other present and future agricultural production. Many persons believe that the interests of Agriculture are therefore well represented by the ALR. However we have seen how government philosophies, and the effects of large population changes can seriously compromise that intent. It is essential that the overall land use planning discussions and processes recognize that the impact of adjacent land uses, urban encroachment, "public use" prioritization and imposition of other jurisdictional limitations affect the ability of farmers to carry on their business and way of life.

The Agriculture sector is generally represented by the BC Federation of Agriculture, the provincial organization of farmers. A steering committee has been formed with representatives from local organizations affiliated with the BCFA as well as other commodity specific and broad based interest groups. The steering committee will meet once a month, and will be consulted as required by phone, or local sub-committee as the substantive issues are brought to the table.

The steering committee is made up of representatives from the following organizations:

- Vancouver Island Dairymen's Association
- Island Milk Producers' Association
- Vancouver Island Chicken Producers Association
- Vancouver Island Egg Producers Association
- Vancouver Island Vegetable Growers Association
- Cowichan Agricultural Society
- Cowichan Agripro Society
- Comox Valley Farmers' Institute
- District 'A' Farmers' Institute
Brian Currie will be the primary spokesperson although as location and issues change, the table representative may change.
CONSERVATION SECTOR
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

This sector comprises a great diversity of interests. They embrace Wilderness Preservation, Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecosystem Integrity; Biodiversity, Forest Community Sustainability and Restoration, Sustainable Forestry and Human Community Sustainability including the carrying capacity of Vancouver Island. Also important to us are urban concerns such as sewage and waste disposal, and quality of water supplies. We list among our interests Canada’s international environmental treaty commitments and responsibilities as well as the local impact of such global issues as ozone depletion and climate change, acid rain and the collapse of offshore marine ecosystems.

We have tried to focus those interests and concerns into one sector, but we have consistently encountered difficulties because of their many points of difference. We would prefer to see several sectors formed to represent the major interests that exist within our current sector rather than attempt to steer those interest to the table under a single committee.

We have held three meetings of representatives of our sectoral constituency in order to establish that broad-based support exists for a Conservation Sector initiative to the CORE table. The more than 150 environmental non-government organizations of the Vancouver Island region have never before joined together in a single umbrella organization. We have not yet managed to create a tight, efficient, cohesive structure under which every group and perspective feels well represented.

We are very confident that our present less than obviously committed presence at the table will be supplanted by one that will allow us to play a productive, informative, and above all, environmentally, socially, and economically responsible role in the CORE process.

At our last sectoral meeting eight observers representing an equal number of organizations and the various regions of Vancouver Island were elected at attend these first two meetings of the CORE table and to report back to the next general sectoral meeting in early January 1993. The makeup of our five-person steering council has been adjusted to reflect the Island’s regions and groups. It is made up of officers of five organizations - Clayoquot Biosphere Society, Friends of the Tsitika, Islands Alliance, Sierra Club of Western Canada, and Western Canada Wilderness Committee (all of which are prepared to produce letters of
authorization if requested.) From the January 1993 general meeting of the sector we expect a more definitive degree of empowerment to arise towards our participation in the CORE process. At the CORE Table meeting of January 15 our designated spokesperson will be prepared to validate for the table their accountability and the accountability of our steering committee to our constituency. They will be able to make available a list of our constituent organizations.

The nucleus of the Conservation Sector's constituency is the membership base of the major wilderness-oriented organizations of Vancouver Island - Western Canada Wilderness Committee, Sierra Club of Western Canada, Sierra Club Groups, Friends of Ecological Reserves, Friends of Clayoquot Sound, The Clayoquot Biosphere Society, and the Carmanah Forestry Society. Their numbers, totalling about 20,000 on Vancouver Island, are bolstered by the members of some 150 smaller organizations that tend to represent community-related concerns and by the members of umbrella organizations and coalitions - the BC Environmental Network, the Arrowsmith Ecological Coalitions, the Save Georgia Strait Alliance, the Islands Alliance, the TIN WIS Alliance, the West Coast Islands Conservancy, and others.

Because of time constraints most communications within our constituency are carried out by fax and telephone. In light of the intensive nature of such communications we are establishing a series of fax and telephone trees to facilitate dissemination of information to and from the grassroots. It is our intention to communicate as effectively as possible within our sector in order to maintain our unity of purpose and to ensure that every interest within our widespread constituency has a voice at the CORE table.
This sector comprises a great diversity of interests. We embrace organizations working for wilderness preservation, terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem integrity, biodiversity, forest community stability and restoration, and sustainable land use and forestry. We also represent groups working for urban concerns such as sewage and waste disposal, water quality, transportation needs, and urban parklands. We also include groups concerned with Canada's international environmental treaty commitments, as well as the local impact of global issues of ozone depletion, climate change and acid rain.

In September of 1992, a new organization, Vancouver Island Network of Environmentalists (VINE) was formed to act as an umbrella for the above interests to receive reports from the Conservation sector table team, and to review CORE table activities. Since that time, VINE has met 8 times with over 50 organizations attending, those organizations representing approximately 25,000 members in and around Vancouver Island.

Through the VINE meetings, periodic mailed reports and countless phone calls, the Conservation sector table team has kept those groups as informed as possible about the complicated and evolving negotiations of the CORE table. The most recent VINE meeting on November 28, reviewed the Conservation sector report and map, but not the CORE table report.

We therefore list the following organizations which have shown support for our Conservation sector table team. We note that there has been inadequate time for the final CORE table report to be circulated and endorsed directly by any of the groups in our sector, at this time. If finances and energy allows we hope to do that over the next several months.

The Conservation sector table team includes direct representation of the following groups:

- Alberni Environmental Coalition
- West Coast Islands Conservancy
- Carmanah Forestry Society
- North Island Coalition for the Environment
- B.C. Wild - The Conservation Alliance
- Friends of Tsitika
- Sierra Club of Western Canada
The following groups have expressed support for our efforts:

Arrowsmith Ecological Assn. Arrowsmith Naturalists
All About Us - Nanaimo Citizen's Action on Recycling
Catalyst Education Society and Environment
Clearcut Alternatives Comox Hill Preservation Society
Cortes Island Forest Committee Cowichan Estuary Preservation Soc.
Canadian Parks and Wilderness Soc. Walbran Watchdog
Citizens Action to Save the Environ. Concerned Residents of North Island
Centre for Holistic Resource Mgmt. Conservancy - Hornby Island
Denman Island Conservancy Clayoquot Biosphere Project
Evergreen Alliance Earthlife Canada Foundation
Friends of Rothbottom Ridge Society Environ. Education Specialists Assn.
Friends of Strathcona Park Friends of Ecological Reserves
Galiano Conservancy Assn. Friends of Cortes Island
Gabriola Watch Green Islands
Gabriola Conservancy Gabriola Forest Committee
Island Alliance Hornby Island Forest Mgmt. Soc.
Kyuquot Economic and Environ. Island Watch Society
Protection Society New Perspectives Forestry Society
Malcolm Island Environmental Project Watershed
Protection Society Sierra Club - Cowichan Group
Landsman Community Service NanOOSE Conservation Campaign
North Island Coastal Watch Raging Grannies
Save Georgia Strait Alliance Vancouver Island Transportation
Wavelength Alternatives
Vancouver Island Rainforest Action Coalition

The following groups have notified us that they do not wish to be represented by the Conservation Sector at CORE:

Council for International Rights and Care for Life on Earth (CIRCLE)
Ecological Rights Association
Friends of Clayoquot Sound
Sierra Club - Victoria Group
Vulnerable Ecologies Protection Society
Western Canada Wilderness Committee
FISHERY SECTOR
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

Sector Perspective:

We have seen the depletion and even extinction of the fish resource and its related employment in a number of places in the world. In most cases this is due to weak or non-existent land use and industrial policy. As a result, fish habitat and watersheds in general have suffered extreme degradation.

It is increasingly clear that without cooperative, integrated management, all our resource based industries are threatened. Our sector hopes these CORE processes will arrive at a land use strategy for British Columbia. It is the mandate of the Fishery Sector to protect fish habitat in all places where fish spawn, develop, move and congregate. Our constituency (approximately 25,000 people) depends for their livelihood on the sustainability of the fish resource.

Sector Structure:

The Fishery Sector represents almost all of British Columbia's significant fishing industry organizations:

1. United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union
2. Fisheries Council of British Columbia (Fish Processors Association)
3. Fishing Vessel Owners Association of British Columbia
4. Deep Sea Trawlers Association of British Columbia
5. Gulf Trollers Association
6. Native Brotherhood of British Columbia
7. Northern Gillnetters Association
8. Northern Trollers Association
9. Nuu-chah-nulth Fisheries Council
10. Pacific Black Cod Fishermen's Association
11. Pacific Coast Fishing Vessel Owners Guild
12. Pacific Gillnetters Association
13. Pacific Seafood Council
14. Pacific Trollers Association
15. Prince Rupert Cooperative Fishermens Guild
16. Prince Rupert Fishermens Cooperative Association
17. Prince Rupert Fishing Vessel Owners Association

These Groups are under the umbrella of the Commercial Fishing Industry Council (CFIC).

In addition, the Cortes Island Association (shellfish and bivalves) will also be represented by the Fishery Sector at the CORE Table.
CONTACTS:

Commercial Fishing Industry Council (CFIC)
Vancouver, B.C.

Contact Person: Scott Hanna
Secretariat/Manager
Phone: 669-2932
Fax: 683-9148

Cortes Island Seafood Association
Cortes Island, B.C.

Contact Person: Delores Broten
Phone and Fax: 935-6992
This sector represents approximately 25,000 workers in direct forest employment, which entails logging, sawmills, pulpmills and longshoremen.

Our sector will have one spokesperson, as we believe that it is imperative to keep the number of representatives at the main table to a minimum in order for the negotiations to be successful. The spokesperson for this sector is Warren Ulley of IWA-Canada. It is the intent of this sector to alternate the spokesperson, if necessary, when dealing with a specific area or sector. The spokesperson will have full authority as all issues will be dealt with through the steering committee.

The steering committee in this sector will consist of 14 representatives from all areas of forest employment. The steering committee has full authority from the people they represent and will also be responsible for keeping them informed.

Please find attached a listing of all steering committee members.

Submitted by:

Warren Ulley, Spokesperson
Forest Employment Sector
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>UNION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Routley</td>
<td>Local 1-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IWA - Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrel Wong</td>
<td>Local 1-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IWA - Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Rewakowsky</td>
<td>Local 1-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IWA - Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy Pederson</td>
<td>Local 1 - 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IWA - Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Dishkin</td>
<td>I.L.W.U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy McKay</td>
<td>Local 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.E.P. #284 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Wilson</td>
<td>Region IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.E.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Bromilow</td>
<td>Local 1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.E.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken McRae</td>
<td>C.E.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Timothy</td>
<td>Local 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.P.W.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim White</td>
<td>Local 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.P.W.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December 2, 1992
1. **Composition.** The Forest Managers and Manufacturers sector (hereafter referred to as "FMM") consists of six companies: Canadian Forest Products Limited, Canadian Pacific Forest Products Ltd., Fletcher Challenge Canada Limited, International Forest Products Limited, MacMillan Bloedel Limited and Western Forest Products Limited.

2. **Diversity.** The six companies conduct forestry operations on both public and private lands in many areas of the Island extending from Holberg in the north to Jordan River in the south. These operations support four pulp and paper mill, two pulp mills and 15 sawmills on the Island and two pulp and paper mills, 1 pulp mill and 14 sawmills on adjacent parts of the Lower Mainland.

3. **Spokesperson.** Sholto Hebbenton will be the principal spokesperson. He will attend all meetings and will communicate the position of the sector on the great majority of matters. However there will be a number of occasions in which it will be more convenient for the FMM sector and more beneficial for the Commission and other sectors at the table if the FMM sector's position is expressed by a Professional Forester or other environmental scientist.

4. **Authority of Spokesperson.** FMM's spokesperson will speak at all times with the full authority of all members of the sector.

5. **Nature of Accountability.** As recommended by the Commission, the FMM sector has created structured communication links between the spokesperson and the members of the sector. Two-way communications will flow through a committee structure which is now in place between all members of the sector and the spokesperson.

6. **Accountability and the Commission's Proceedings.**

   (a) **Procedural Matters**

   Procedural matters will be considered within the FMM committee structure and in most cases the FMM spokesperson will be able to provide decisions on a "next meeting" basis. That is, procedural matters will be dealt with between the meetings in a format which will enable the spokesperson to communicate a decision which has been accepted by all members of the sector.
(b) Substantive Matters

With respect to substantive issues, FMM's position is that there can be no final agreement on substantive matters until all such matters have been resolved. In view of the competitive relationship between the six members of the group, it is at this stage unthinkable that there could be piecemeal agreement on matters on substance as the proceedings continue. The FMM sector is not expressing an unwillingness to accept tentative decisions. In view of the enormous size of the task facing the Commission, the process would be unmanageable if participants were unwilling to make tentative agreements respecting one issue which would be conditional on receiving reciprocal agreements relating to some other issue or issues. The FMM sector anticipates that many other sectors will have the same view, that no sector should be asked to accept a final position until all matters have been considered and the consensus decision has been reached.

7. Adherence to Final Decision. The members of the FMM sector have the ability to make commitments which will govern the operations of all the member companies.
GENERAL EMPLOYMENT SECTOR
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

Who is the General Employment Sector?

The General Employment Sector is comprised of the B.C. Government Employees' Union, the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local Union No. 115, and the United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 1518.

We represent workers in:

- direct provincial government - all ministries, resource and non-resource
- banks and credit unions
- colleges - instruction
- longer term care hospitals
- daycare facilities
- social service agencies
- home support agencies
- community living facilities
- legal services
- construction
- highway construction and maintenance
- industrial - rental, waste management, mining, poultry processing, meat warehousing, agricultural supplies
- food stores
- department stores
- hotels
- marinas
- hi-tech industries - B.C. Systems Corporation
- laboratories

Our Structure

We have a steering committee of one representative from each union.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>REPR</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>FAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Government Employees Union</td>
<td>Cliff Stainsby</td>
<td>388-9948</td>
<td>384-8060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Union of Operating Engineers, Local Union No. 115</td>
<td>Jim Goldsack or Tim Cullen</td>
<td>754-4022 or 754-4022</td>
<td>754-5513 or 754-5513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1518</td>
<td>Frank Pozzobon</td>
<td>434-3101</td>
<td>434-4145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Auto Workers Local 3019</td>
<td>Ron Weatherall</td>
<td>286-1800</td>
<td>286-1119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We make decisions by consensus. Our representative at the table is Cliff Stainsby. We will alternate the spokesperson as required by issues and circumstances.

**Accountability**

Each Union is a democratic organization with a well established structure of executive officers elected by conventions of its members. The steering committee member of each union reports to the appropriate executive and committee structures within their respective unions.
1. Purpose

The AVIM will facilitate and coordinate the participation of the local government sector in the Commission on Resources and Environment Vancouver Island regional negotiation process.

2. Structure

The structure of local government sector representation will consist of:
(a) regional committees
(b) an island-wide based steering committee
(c) negotiation spokespersons ("table representatives")

3. Steering Committee

Two representatives from the following regional district areas shall comprise the Steering Committee:

1. Alberni-Clayoquot
2. Capital
3. Comox-Strathcona
4. Cowichan Valley
5. Mount Waddington
6. Nanaimo

2.1.1 Appointments to Steering Committee

Two elected officials from among the municipal and regional governments within each district shall be appointed to the Steering Committee. The manner of appointment shall be determined by those governments.

2.1.2 Term

The term of appointment shall be until the conclusion of the CORE Vancouver Island process or replaced by other appointments.
"Alternates" shall be named by those making appointments.

2.1.3 Roles and Responsibilities of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee shall take direction and advice from the Regional Committees. The role of the Steering Committee shall be to:

- Define authority of Table Representatives
- Final decision making authority
- Coordinate regions
- Report to regional committees
- Set policy
- Define local government positions
- Direct secretariat
- Define Table Representatives

2.1.4 Manner of decision-making

The Steering Committee shall determine its manner of decision-making.

2.2 Table Representatives

The Table Representatives shall represent the interests of the local government during shared decision making.

2.2.1 Appointment of Table Representatives

The Steering Committee shall appoint two representatives to the shared decision-making process. The representation shall not be members of the Steering Committee.

2.2.2 Term

The term of appointment shall be until the conclusion of the CORE Vancouver Island process or replaced by other appointments.
2.2.3 Roles and Responsibilities of Table Representatives

The Table Representatives shall co-chair the Steering Committee. The Table Representative shall take direction and advice from the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee shall define the authority and mandate of the Table Representatives at its first meeting, and thereafter as required.

2.3 Regional Committees

Within each regional district a regional committee shall be established to provide advice and direction to the Steering Committee.

The role of the Regional Committee shall be to:

- Define regional interests
- Regional issue definition
- Represent "elected" sector
- Staff support to Steering Committee
- Regional information gathering
- Elect 2 Steering Committee members each
- Report to regional constituents

2.4 Secretariat

A small staff secretariat shall be formed to assist local government.

The Secretariat shall consist of one contract (one-half time) analyst and secretarial support.

The Secretariat shall:

- provide support to negotiators and Steering Committee in analyzing, formulating and establishing local government positions.
- determine the needs and interests of all affected communities.
- assist in communications with local government.
The Secretariat shall be located in Victoria at the AVIM office.

2.5 Attendance at Negotiations

Table Representatives shall attend all meetings of the sectoral negotiations.

It is understood that up to two meetings per month of one or two day's duration will be scheduled during the December 1992 - August 1993 period.

Steering Committee members may attend meetings at their discretion.

Staff of the Secretariat may attend.

2.6 Position of Local Government

Local government does not represent a "sector", but rather a level of government and the Island communities they represent. Our objectives are what is good for Vancouver Island communities.

Our constituency is not environmental, logging, youth, seniors, natives, non-natives, etc. Our constituency is Vancouver Island. We do not intend to negotiate for any particular interest group. We were elected to represent all views and we will do our best to represent the interests of Vancouver Island.

We intend to carry out consultation in all six regions which will include public community meetings. We intend to bring a community not sectoral view to the table.

2.7 SUMMARY

In the next nine to ten months we are being asked to participate in an unique planning exercise. Like most of you, I will be spend many days, nights and weekends away from home and family; and I could be enjoying those things that make Vancouver Island a great place.
My small sacrifice is the small sacrifice that all around the table must make.

Our objective is substantive communities - economically and environmentally.
MINING SECTOR
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

The Mining industry has tended to organize itself into a series of partly overlapping associations. The distinctions between them are sometimes stage of the industry (exploration and production), geographical region (Canada, B.C. East Kootenays, etc.) and sometimes commodity (coal, metal mines, sand and gravel operations, etc.). Those industry groups which clearly have an interest in the CORE process include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.C. and Yukon Chamber of Mines</td>
<td>(BC and YCM) represents prospectors and exploration companies in B.C. and the Yukon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Association of B.C.</td>
<td>(MABC) represents producing mines in B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada</td>
<td>(PDAC) represents prospectors, explorers and developers across the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Association of Canada</td>
<td>(MAC) represents producing mining companies across Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Association of Canada</td>
<td>(CAC) represents coal producers across Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Suppliers, Contractors and Consultants Association of B.C.</td>
<td>represents the &quot;technical services&quot; side of the mining industry as opposed to non-technical, such as hotels or shipping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CORE Vancouver Island Mining Industry Steering Committee formally
represents the B.C. and Yukon Chamber of Mines (BC and Yukon) and the Mining Association of B.C. (MABC). The other associations listed above, although not formally represented, have interests closely aligned with ours. Likewise, the mining industry labour unions are not represented by our committee although they would likely have similar interests.

The Committee members thus far tentatively appointed are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>ASSOCIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce McKnight</td>
<td>Westmin</td>
<td>BC &amp; YCM, MABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td>BC &amp; YCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Barr</td>
<td>Barra Minerals</td>
<td>BC &amp; YCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td>BC &amp; YCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Berkshire</td>
<td>Iron River</td>
<td>BC &amp; YCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Patterson</td>
<td>BC &amp; YCM</td>
<td>BC &amp; YCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Sumarik</td>
<td>MABC</td>
<td>MABC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ministry industry steering committee has no authority nor power to bind its members but it does take direction from the BC and YCM and MABC, and it is believed to represent a consensus of mining industry concerns, positions and interests. The committee reports to the BC and YCM and MABC on a regular basis and obtains regular feedback from the two associations and their constituent members.
OUTDOOR RECREATION SECTOR
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

CONSTITUENCY:

We directly represent approximately 165,000 citizens of BC (including 45,000 in the BC Wildlife Federation) who share interests and concerns relating to Outdoor Recreation, and who have expressed their involvement by joining some type of outdoor-oriented club.

In addition, we consider that we speak for those citizens of BC, in fact comprising the majority of the population, who value outdoor recreation. We point to the following facts:

- About 10 percent of those who take part in an outdoor activity join a club to do so.
- Government surveys indicate that 56% of British Columbians say that outdoor recreation is very important compared to their other interests, and 88% say that it is important.
- An aggregate of 500,000 hunting and fishing licenses is sold per year in BC.

We estimate that about one quarter of our constituents actually reside on Vancouver Island. However, we regard representation by citizens from throughout BC as not only appropriate, but necessary to the fairness of this process. Just as decisions made in urban power centers off Vancouver Island affect those who live here, so land use decisions on Vancouver Island affect all citizens of BC.

PERSPECTIVE:

We approach land use planning from a perspective of concern for the preservation and enhancement of the natural values needed to allow the quality of experience that is central to outdoor recreation.

STRUCTURE:

Our direct constituency is organized into approximately 1000 clubs, most of which
are in turn organized through about 35 larger organizations. The organizations that are taking most active roles in this planning initiative are:

* BC Wildlife Federation
* Federation of Mountain Clubs of BC
* Federation of BC Naturalists
* Sea Kayak Association of BC
* Steelhead Society of BC
* Council of BC Yacht Clubs
* Recreational Canoeing Association of BC
* Four Wheel Drive Association of BC
* BC Snowmobile Association
* Backcountry Horsemen of BC
* Lapidary, Rock and Mineral Society of BC
* Whitewater Kayaking Association of BC
* Bicycle Association of BC (Mountain Bike Section)

(* Indicates direct representation on our steering committee)

LINES OF COMMUNICATION:

1. FORMAL

Since almost all of our member organizations are also members of the Outdoor Recreation Council of BC, we are using the Council's administrative structure to send information bulletins and requests for input to our constituent organizations. Within the constraints of our budget, we are sending these directly to the local club level.

We are asking the clubs to assume responsibility for informing their members and receiving, and passing on, input from them.

2. INFORMAL

As indicated above, most of our active organizations are directly represented in the steering committee. Committee members have the responsibility to communicate with their organizations through direct contact, and to bring back their concerns to the committee.
OUTDOOR RECREATION STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Harvey Richardson
B.C. Wildlife Federation

Rory Brown
Four Wheel Drive Association of B.C.

Tony Embleton
Federation of B.C. Naturalists

Dave Zuest
Sea Kayak Association of B.C.

Al Fairhurst
Council of B.C. Yacht Clubs

Syd Watts
Federation of Mountain Clubs of B.C.

Joe Saysell
B.C. Wildlife Federation and Steelhead Society of B.C.

Phil Stone
Vancouver Island Backbone Trail

Don Cohen
Whitewater Kayak Association of B.C.

Ray Pillman
Outdoor Recreation Council of B.C.

Sarah Golling
Outdoor Recreation Council Advisory Member

Les Carter
Outdoor Recreation Council Advisory Member
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY SECTOR
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

The Social and Economic Sustainability Sector is a coalition of Vancouver Island organizations and individuals whose communities are inextricably linked to the multiple use of our natural resources. It is the use of these natural resources which form the cornerstone upon which the social, economic and cultural values of our rural communities are built.

We understand that change in the way we manage resources is inevitable, even desirable, but this change must include social and economic sustainability. No discussion of resource allocation can be complete without a thorough understanding of the long-term implications on the economic and social fabric of an affected community and the people who live there.

Sustainable means long-term and responsible use of resources that is compatible with other land uses. We maintain that a stable economy is necessary to promote a healthy environment and social structure.

Our member organizations represent a broad base of Vancouver Island citizens who are fully committed to a framework of shared decision making. In the final analysis those people with a significant potential to be affected must be allowed to maintain strong voice.

Structural Program for Accountability to the Regions and Effectiveness at the Table

THE SECTOR:

The Social and Economic Sustainability Sector (SESS) is a coalition of organizations throughout Vancouver Island who have a firm belief that a large number of valid interests were not adequately represented at the Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE) table and that it is the membership of these very interests that will be affected most by CORE recommendation.
THE STRUCTURE:

Meeting the goal set for all other sectors, SESS will have only one negotiator at the table at a time. Behind the negotiator will be a sixteen member Steering Committee made up of four people from each of the four regions. Vancouver Island was divided into by the original organizational committee. Each of these members will be responsible to the regional committees and to the area organizations or interests of which they are a member.

The Negotiator:

This person is to be chosen from the general membership of the SESS. Aside from acting as the negotiator this person will also be a member of the Steering Committee and will participate in all committee meetings that take place in the region of his or her residence. Provisions may be made for the negotiator to attend some of the Committee meetings held in other regions. They will, where possible, be the primary contact point with the CORE staff and other Sectors when CORE is not in session. The Alternate Negotiator should be chosen from those on Steering Committee who have been able to make the necessary time commitment.

The Steering Committee:

The sixteen member Steering Committee will consist of four representative from each of the geographic regions. Each region will elect their Steering Committee members, normally it shall consist of one person from each of the different member organizations. It remains in the hands of each individual region to provide continuity in representation to the Steering Committee but the seat recognizes that alternates will be necessary.

The Steering Committee will meet at the members discretion, but as a rule these meetings will take place on the evening before the CORE negotiations. When CORE is held outside the Parksville area it shall be the responsibility of the Regional Coordinator to set the time, date and location of the meeting.
Furthermore, when asked the Steering Committee will include groups who understand and find compatible the goals of this Sector, as identified in the Mission Statement. Should they have the means to commit to having a full time representative at the meetings their input would be welcomed. We, like CORE, wish to be inclusive as possible and would make room for all others who have heretofore not been heard from.

The Regional Coordinator:

One member from each of the four regions will act as a Regional Coordinator. All CORE related material will be passed through these people before it is sent to the other regional Steering Committee members and their constituent organizations. As the contact point for their region they will also be responsible for arranging the Regional Committee meetings and ensuring that all those interested, including the public, are invited. The Regional Coordinator will also attempt to make sure all information is received in all regions in a timely fashion. This will require extensive contact between the four regional representatives and an efficient communications network.

The Regional Committees:

The strength of SESS lies in the regional meetings and the depth of concern that is now emerging in rural communities over land use issues and resource allocation. While the organizations and the members themselves realize the importance of the CORE process, and a need to move toward resolution to some very difficult issues they all have businesses, jobs, families, outside interests, and prior commitments that simply will not allow for the massive time and resource commitment CORE requires. However, they do have time, energy and resources to become involved in the regional meetings that are held in the evenings in or near their homes and families. However, they will have friends and neighbours amongst those attending from their region, and such a forum lends itself to the generation of enthusiastic and workable ideas. It is to these Regional Committees that the Steering Committee and the Negotiator will be accountable. It is from these meetings, which are open to all, that the focus of the seat will come.
The Member Organizations:

A great deal of responsibility will be placed on the various groups that make up the SES Sector. The various members that are chosen to be representatives in the CORE process will be held directly accountable to the membership of these groups or interests, and because CORE is open to the public they will, whenever possible, attempt to send additional members to watch and ensure their needs are being filled by the negotiator and the Steering Committee. It is important to remember that the constituent groups of the SES Sector all meet on a regular basis, publish newsletters and hold various non-related events where issues raised at CORE will be an item for discussion and debate.

The Sector Meeting:

It will be to the benefit of all concerned that the entire Sector meet on at least two occasions over the next few months. These meetings, organized by the Steering Committee, will be held on a day prior to a three day CORE session and will aid in bringing the SESS members closer together and ensure continuity. These meetings will likely be held when CORE is in the Parksville area. Such meetings help lend authority to the Steering Committee and the negotiating team.
TOURISM SECTOR
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

The Tourism Sector speaks on behalf of and is accountable to the tourism industry on Vancouver Island through the Tourism Association of Vancouver Island (TAVI), an umbrella organization which markets Vancouver Island as a destination. TAVI membership consists of Vancouver Island tourism businesses, Chambers of Commerce and tourism associations such as Tourism Victoria. The Spokesperson and the Steering Committee represent tourism and tourism-related businesses from around the Island who are familiar with tourism issues in their communities.

In addition, the Tourism Association of Vancouver Island is a member of The Council of Tourism Associations of British Columbia (COTA), a province-wide organization, advocating the interests of over 180,000 tourism and tourism-related jobs in over 12,000 businesses that will be directly affected by tourism’s ability to access the resource base and maintain the internationally competitive quality of the Province’s tourism products.
YOUTH SECTOR
(GROUP REPRESENTING YOUTH FOR FUTURE INTERESTS NOW)
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

Structure, accountability and authority:

GRYFIN is representative of a wide spectrum of youth interests and concerns across Vancouver Island. Too often, the accountability of such a representative group or person is cashed out in terms of dollars. If the constituents have paid their taxes, their membership fees, or their union dues, it is assumed that those in authority have been granted the right to speak for the group. GRYFIN rejects this hierarchical structure and tries instead to implement a more truly participatory model of representation with direct lines of communication and feedback. To facilitate this model, GRYFIN has built a structural framework that allows for both solid lines of accountability and effective decision making. The following diagram illustrates the structure of GRYFIN and the relationships between the component parts:

Our general constituency has direct input into GRYFIN through our conferences which we plan to hold every six weeks (dependent on funding). These conferences are completely open to youth and we have made every effort to contact as broad a range of individuals and groups as possible. (Our mailing list includes over 200 schools, colleges, universities, youth groups, and individuals.) All major decisions and policies are ratified at our general assembly meetings.

Our steering committee and subcommittees are also always open to new members. Between conferences, information on CORE is funneled back to our members through a short newsletter that is produced following each convening of the table. Members from all over the island also have direct input into our decision making through an established phone tree that links them with the negotiators and advisers. Members are contacted with regard to relevant issues like funding or interim measures and talk directly to those present at the negotiations.

GRYFIN is doing further work to build a broad level of constituency support through a petition. With the petition, youth from all over the Island are choosing to support GRYFIN's mandate and empower the organization to represent their interests at the CORE table. At present, we have over 500 signatures, names, addresses, and telephone numbers - and the list is growing constantly. Those youth contacted through schools and on the streets also have an opportunity to discuss CORE and GRYFIN with active members and to become actively involved themselves.

In order to be inclusive of the younger elements of our constituency, we are actively soliciting art and poetry from elementary schools across the Island. These submissions will be compiled and submitted to the table in the Spring.

The media subcommittee of GRYFIN is presently establishing a media network that will inform more youth about the CORE process and will draw in even more members and supporters of GRYFIN.
Given the inherent financial and technical limitations of a youth sector, GRYFIN is doing everything in its power to ensure clear lines of authority and accountability and to manifest Stephen Owen's and our vision of a more truly participatory democracy.
APPENDIX TWO

PROCESS AND PROCEDURE AGREEMENT
PROCESS AND PROCEDURE AGREEMENT

FOR

THE VANCOUVER ISLAND REGIONAL
LAND USE NEGOTIATION TABLE

COMMISSION ON RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Process and Procedure Agreement contains the consensus of all participants in the Vancouver Island Regional Land Use Negotiation process. It describes the process structure and procedural groundrules which will govern the participants' involvement. Participants are engaged in the process by choice, at the invitation of the Commission on Resources and Environment.

1.2 The Commission has been required by the Provincial Government to develop a comprehensive land use strategy for British Columbia. As part of that project, the Commission is required to publicly report to Cabinet on large scale land use zones for Vancouver Island region with a view to addressing the region's land use and related resource and environmental issues.

1.3 The Commission's report will result from, where possible, a shared decision-making process based on the principles of interest based negotiation.

1.4 The process must consider and attempt to balance and integrate economic, environmental and societal interests, keeping in mind local, provincial and federal government responsibilities and the interests of First Nations.

1.5 The process must consider the principle of intergenerational equity and must also consider and take into account the preservation of our global heritage and the interests of non-human species.

2.0 PURPOSE

2.1 The purpose is to develop a set of recommendations for the Commissioner concerning appropriate land use and related resource and environmental issues in the region.

2.2 The process will take the form of shared decision-making assisted by mediation, technical expertise and shared information.
3.0 PARTICIPANTS

3.1 The negotiation will include all individuals, persons and groups whose interests are significantly and directly affected by land use and related resource and environmental issues in the region. Participants will include:

a) those who have the legal statutory or practical authority to make a decision;

b) those affected by the results of the decision; and,

c) those who could delay or block the implementation of the decision.

3.2 Participant individuals and groups will be represented at the negotiating table by sector. A sector is a constituency of participants which contributes a unique perspective to the issues being negotiated.

3.3 Sectors are established by:

a) constituencies of participants who share common values and perspectives requesting recognition as a sector;

b) the Commission recognizing the uniqueness of the proposed constituency; and,

c) the table accepting the sector as having a perspective which can contribute to the negotiation.

3.4 Sectors are organized by their steering groups. Steering groups inform, instruct and support sectoral spokespersons at the negotiating table.

3.5 Spokespersons are chosen by sectoral steering groups to represent the perspectives of sectors at the negotiating table. Designated spokespersons are recognized to speak to issues at the negotiating table. Sectors may also designate alternates to serve in the place of spokespersons.
3.6 Other persons, such as designated observers, may be asked to address the table on terms agreeable to the table.

3.7 The combination of all spokespersons at the negotiating table is known as "the Table".

4.0 MEDIATION

4.1 The Regional Negotiation will be conducted as a mediation. Mediation is a process in which negotiating parties agree to engage the assistance of a trained, impartial neutral party to facilitate the process of negotiation. Mediation does not confer on the mediator any substantive decision making power. The mediator has the ability to assist the table and to make procedural decisions about the negotiation.

4.2 The table will choose a mediator or mediation team who must be endorsed by the table.

5.0 TASK

5.1 Without prejudice to the constitutional rights of the First Nations, including Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, and to their rights and treaty negotiations, the table will decide for the Vancouver Island region mutually acceptable recommendations for the Commissioner to make to the public and to Cabinet regarding:

a) Land use allocation including the designation of broad land use categories such as protected, special management, integrated or intensive resource management areas;

b) Transition and mitigation strategies for all those, including communities, affected by land use allocations;

c) Priority issues that must be addressed through community based planning processes, or through special studies;
d) Implementation and monitoring matters including such items as methods, schedules and required resources; and,

e) Other points that the parties wish to convey.

5.2 The table will continue with the task defined in this paragraph until any of the following events occurs:

a) those at the table agree to stop meeting;

b) the Commissioner directs the table not to carry on; or

c) the table reaches outcomes on all the elements of the task.

6.0 **TIME FRAME AND SCHEDULE**

6.1 The table will seek to complete its recommendations by August 31, 1993, or such extended date as the Commissioner designates.

6.2 The table will meet at regular intervals and on particular dates and times as it shall agree.

7.0 **NEGOTIATING PRINCIPLES**

7.1 The objective is to reach consensus. Consensus is reached when the participants agree on a package of provisions that address the entire range of issues; in other words, it is essential that each participant supports the overall agreement. The participants may not agree with all aspects of an agreement; but they do not disagree enough to warrant their opposition to the overall package.

If, having negotiated in good faith, the participants find that they can reach agreement on a significant majority of the issues, but cannot agree on a limited number of issues, they may agree to disagree on those issues. They should describe clearly the areas of
disagreement. They may indicate that further investigation is necessary on one or more of the unsettled issues. They may suggest that one or more of the unsettled issues be referred to some other decision-making process.

With respect to the issues on which a sector withholds agreement, that sector is responsible for explaining how its interests are adversely affected or how the proposed agreement fails to meet its interests. The sector withholding agreement must propose alternatives and other sectors must consider how all interests may be met.

7.2 Participants at the table acknowledge that their negotiation is a shared decision-making process resulting in land use decisions recommended to the Commissioner. Shared decision-making means that on a certain set of issues, for a defined period of time, those with authority to make a decision at the table and those who will be affected by that decision are empowered to jointly seek an outcome that accommodates rather than compromises the interests of all concerned.

7.3 The table will seek integrated outcomes in the decisions it makes. An integrated outcome is one in which the parties elect to work together, integrating their resources, originality and expertise.

7.4 Spokespersons at the table will act in good faith. Acting in good faith means remaining honest throughout the negotiation process and contributing to the development of negotiations.

7.5 Each sector respects the legitimacy of the desires, needs, concerns, fears, and hopes of each of the other sectors.

7.6 The primary focus of spokespersons will be their sector's interests rather than its position. All sectors will work to maximize the mutual accomplishment of all sectors' interests. Interests mean desires, needs, concerns, fears and hopes.
7.7 Spokespersons will refrain from personal attacks and accusatory remarks about others during negotiation sessions.

7.8 All at the table will regard as a priority the need to listen to, and hear, what each spokesperson at the table is saying.

7.9 All agreements and understandings reached during discussion of an issue shall be tentative only, and shall be conditional upon consensus on the total "package" of which the issue is a part.

7.10 The table retains the right to manage its own process and to change any of the terms of this agreement by consent of all.

8.0 CORNERSTONES

8.1 The table recognizes the principles expressed in the Commission's draft "Land Use Charter".

8.2 The table will have regard to previous and ongoing planning and negotiation processes within the Vancouver Island region.

8.3 All sectors and spokespersons acknowledge that the shared decision-making process is both a dispute resolution process and planning process. As such, the negotiation is an attempt to settle plans by solving disputes over conflicting values. As a settlement process, the parties agree that all communication and notes made by any spokesperson or by the mediator or a servant of the Commissioner shall be treated by all participants as "without prejudice". Accordingly, no participant or the mediator or any servant of the Commissioner will be required by any other participant to provide information, give evidence or produce documents in any legal proceeding concerning the context of any of the negotiation meetings.

8.4 Sectoral spokespersons agree that their representations to the media will be respectful of other sectors, supportive of the process, and will attempt to accurately reflect the views of others.
MEETING PROCEDURES

9.1 Each meeting of the table will be held as scheduled and will be preceded by circulation of the mediator's summary notes from the previous meeting together with an agenda for the meeting. The agendas will be annotated, identifying the issues to be discussed, the purpose of the discussion and other related information.

9.2 Spokespersons will fully explore all the matters at issue with a view towards seeking an outcome that accommodates rather than compromises the interests of all concerned. In that regard, spokespersons shall seek to:

a) clearly articulate their interests and the interests of those they represent;

b) understand the interests of other participants whether or not they are in agreement with them; and,

c) identify solutions that meet the interests of the other parties as well as their own.

9.3 Spokespersons will make a special effort to listen carefully, ask pertinent questions and educate themselves and others regarding the interests that must be addressed in a joint problem solving atmosphere.

9.4 Only spokespersons designated by a sector, or others asked to address the table, have the right to speak aloud during meetings of the table. Spokespersons agree to refrain from outbursts and interrupting, and will speak when recognized by the mediator.

9.5 Meetings shall not be recorded verbatim by electronic or other means subject to the following:

a) Each sector may make its own written record of meetings.

b) With the prior approval of the table, certain portions of meetings may be recorded electronically or by other means.
9.6 Summary notes of the proceedings which highlight such matters as the area of discussion, tasks to be undertaken by individuals or organizations and any emerging areas of agreement shall be kept by the mediator.

9.7 All meetings of the table are open to the public including the media. The media are asked to indicate their presence. Both the public and the media are expected to respect the proceedings and these process rules.

The table retains the right to close meetings to the public and the media if it is in the best interest of the process.

9.8 Working groups may be formed by the table to address particular issues or perform specific tasks. Such groups may include persons other than spokespersons. Working groups shall bring back their findings and recommendations to the table for consideration.

10.0 INFORMATION

10.1 The table will have at its disposal technical information:

a) already provided by the Commissioner;

b) sought by the table and funded by the Commissioner subject to the resources available;

c) provided by each sector, including government; and,

d) of such other nature as it seeks, including requests to the Commissioner to seek information on the table's behalf under Section 6 of the Commissioner on Resources and Environment's Act.
The table may invite such technical experts, resource specialists or other person as the table may agree upon.

Each sector will provide to the table through a spokesperson such information, other than confidential information, as may reasonably be necessary for negotiating a fully informed shared decision.

11.0 COMMUNICATION

11.1 Participants acknowledge the crucial importance of, and responsibility for, communication between:

a) spokespersons and their steering groups; and,

b) steering groups and their sectors.

11.2 A summary statement suitable for discussion with the media and general public may be prepared from time to time and agreed upon as a formal statement describing the progress of the table. When discussing the statement, table spokespersons will respond within the spirit of this summary statement.

This agreement endorsed on March 11, 1993, in Parksville, British Columbia, on behalf of the following Sectors:

AGRICULTURE

SOCIAL & ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY

CONSERVATION

FISHERY
FOREST EMPLOYMENT
FOREST INDUSTRY INDEPENDENTS

FOREST MANAGERS AND MANUFACTURERS
GENERAL EMPLOYMENT

LOCAL GOVERNMENT
MINING

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT
RECREATION

TOURISM
YOUTH
APPENDIX THREE

INTEREST STATEMENTS
NEEDS:
- a stable land base, secure from urban encroachment, no more subdivision or alienation within ALR
- intertidal shellfish growing areas be protected within the ALR
- healthy rural communities to provide support and infrastructure for agricultural production
- healthy urban communities for markets
- high quality water, both fresh and salt
- rational policy for multi-use access to shellfish growing beaches, especially for recreational users
- the market place provide a living wage for people in agriculture/aquaculture
- more than niche marketing opportunities
- a consuming public that realizes and understands that high quality, sustainably produced food is not cheap

DESIREs:
- the image of the farmer be seen as a business manager, a technician growing a renewable crop using sustainable practices, a caring and efficient raiser of livestock, as well as having most of the attributes of the urban dweller
- recognition of food production as not only a necessity for survival, and as an essential primary economic generator, but as a truly sustainable and renewable resource, as it has demonstrated for most of the recorded history of humankind
- banking and financial institutions that will use people trained and conversant in agriculture/aquaculture when dealing with farm financing
- politicians and decision makers with a long view and vision for their constituents
- increased and secure access to high quality B.C. coastal water, free of pollution, both industrial and particularly from sewage

CONCERNS:
- an ever decreasing appreciation of rural and farm life
- 'lip service' only, being given to concerns for farmers and farmland, urbanites look on farmland as 'their' green space
- consumers influencing regulatory and legislative authorities without knowledge of the science, leading to uninformed zoning and other constraints restricting access and ability to farm
- this same lack of knowledge endangering the consumer due to residual pesticides on imported cheaper food
- the depleting 'eco-balance' of importing foods from long distances requiring large quantities of non-renewable fossil fuels
AGRICULTURE/AQUACULTURE SECTOR
INTEREST STATEMENT
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- consumers who are denied really fresh food, ripened 'on the vine' have no idea what a
taste treat they are missing, something that is perpetuated by fast food restaurants
emphasizing conformity and speed rather than taste and quality
- non-sustainable methods used to grow food that we import, e.g. irrigating the desert,
using vast quantities of water with no concern for the effect on ground water supplies or
people
- we are missing our opportunities for value-added manufacturing
- as farmers become more efficient and there are fewer of us, we have a smaller and
smaller influence on policy makers

FEARS:

- lack of contact with growing plants and animals leads to extreme positions because of
ignorance of natural phenomena
- as the agriculture community shrinks it has less appeal to politicians, hence, more is
done 'to' it than 'for' it
- opportunities for growth will be limited by incomplete and incorrect information, and
conflicts between and within provincial and federal jurisdictions

HOPES:

- society will develop a new respect for land and water based, renewable resource
industries and that some good sense will prevail and vocal extremes will be treated as
deserved
- a greater understanding of the significant economic and employment benefits that all
farming can provide for rural communities
CONSERVATION SECTOR
INTEREST STATEMENT

"In wildness is the preservation of the world."
Henry David Thoreau

"We abuse land because we see it as a commodity belonging to us. When we begin to see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect."
Aldo Leopold

There are two main constituents in our Sector. We represent those who focus primarily on protection of wilderness areas, old-growth forests, critical fish and wildlife habitat, and marine life. The main goal of this focus is to establish a fully representative system of protected areas. The other main constituents of our Sector are those who focus primarily on sustainable use of land, water, and air outside of present and future protected areas.

Our commitment to conservation is based on the following interests:

- We have a fundamental interest in conserving the diversity of life at all levels. This includes the genetic variation within species; the full range of native species; and the full range of ecosystem diversity. It is essential to conserve fully functional wilderness ecosystems which must be large enough to sustain their ecological integrity in the long run.

- The loss of biodiversity may deprive us of such life-supporting essentials as clean water and air, or yet-to-be-discovered pharmaceutical products.

- All life has value in and of itself - independent of human activity, need, or convenience. We endeavour to speak with humility for that which cannot speak for itself.

- Living with, in, and around the natural environment is as essential to our psychological and spiritual well-being as pure water and air is essential to our physical well-being.

Our commitment to sustainable land use is based on the following interests:

- Healthy functioning ecosystems are the foundation of sustainable economies. We support the Commission's definition of sustainable: that is, capable of being maintained indefinitely and capable of meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
CONSERVATION SECTOR INTEREST STATEMENT
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- We must derive greater social benefits from the use of fewer environmental assets. We support the use of full cost accounting to help us assess the costs and benefits of economic activity. We must ensure that non-renewable resources are not exhausted.

- The land allocation question faced by this Table is inextricably linked to questions of forest tenure, forest policy, and diversification of the provincial economy. We wish to see a tenure system that provides the greatest possible mix of social benefits to the people of B.C. and Vancouver island. We wish to see a shared decision-making model similar to this process used in the management of land, air and water. We wish to see diversification of the economy into areas of value-added manufacturing.

- We are interested in conserving communities where people live together in a sustainable and harmonious relation with each other and the environment.

- We hope that the government and this Table will respect First Nations of Vancouver Island. We believe we have much to learn from the traditions of First Nations about sustainable and respectful ways of living on the land.

- We are committed to Canada's global responsibility and international commitments to protect, conserve and enhance our natural environment. We want to be proud of our Province and our country for its leadership in environmental stewardship and protection.

- The onus is on the present generation to exercise the precautionary principle, recognizing that human understanding of nature is incomplete. We cannot presume to know what levels and methods of resource use and extraction will prove sustainable in the long run. Failure to conserve now, may do irreparable harm to the interests of future generations.
FISHERY SECTOR
INTEREST STATEMENT

The needs, desires and concerns of the Fishery Sector can be met by a genuine commitment to the protection, perpetuation and restoration of fish habitat.

Our Sector’s interest is to protect wild fish habitat, which includes fresh and saltwater systems and the geophysical features which form them.

In concrete terms this means we have to maintain water levels, water purity, the physical integrity of spawning beds, streams, estuary and tidal bottoms and prevent the erosion of watersheds.

The health and abundance of the wild stock is dependent on the acts as a litmus test for the environmental health of the watersheds. Under the right conditions the wild fish resource will be perpetually sustainable.

The fears of the Fishery Sector can also be simply described. We fear the extinction that could surely follow depredations against fish habitat. Along with the disappearance of the fish would also come the disappearance of the unique way of life we maintain in our fishing communities.

We have seen in the past, strategies for the protection of wild fish habitat ignored and poorly enforced. The Tripp report which surveyed 21 streams on Vancouver Island logged between 1989-1991, showed a large percentage of non-compliance with the 1988 Fish and Forestry Guidelines. The findings of the report indicated ineffective monitoring and enforcement of these guidelines with no consequences to the violators. We fear that failure to put into place mechanisms to enforce protective guidelines will lead to continuing violations. Only assured enforcement and swift and costly punishment for failure to observe guidelines will alleviate this fear. Apologies and feeble mitigation attempts will not be enough.

There is no just compensation for the loss of wild fish habitat or the loss of our way of life.

Only responsible integrated resource use will assure the sustainability of wild stock and our communities.
FOREST EMPLOYMENT SECTOR
INTEREST STATEMENT

We represent the men and women employed in the Forest Sector of Vancouver Island. The forest is our life and it is our future. It represents to us our current source of livelihood; it is the cornerstone of our communities and the basis on which we hope to build a secure and prosperous future for our children and future generations of Islanders.

Because the forest represents our future, we are vitally interested in ensuring that it is sustainably managed. We urge the adoption of forest management techniques, such as intensive silviculture, that will improve forest yields. We urge harvesting techniques that will do the least possible damage to the soil and other elements of the forest ecology. And we urge proper reforestation and site preparation methods that ensure the regeneration of our forests after harvest.

We believe that through the adoption of sound techniques of forest management and rigorous application of science of forest ecology, we can sustainably care for our forests and in many instances actually increase forest growth and yield. This is one key to long-term employment creation and community stability.

Another means to ensuring a secure and prosperous future for residents of this Island is to better use the wood and fibre our forests can produce. Historically, we have used our wood primarily to make sawn lumber, plywood, pulp and paper. While these will continue to be among our economic mainstays, they will not be enough in the 1990s and beyond. To ensure that we gain the maximum possible value from the wood we harvest, we must:

- strive to develop new markets for existing products and design or create innovative new products based on wood or fibre;
- invest more in research and development and encourage science-based and technical innovations based on wood and fibre, as well as forest science, forest management and silviculture;
- develop value-added and remanufacturing processes that ensure production and export of a wider range of wood and paper products produced on Vancouver Island;
- increase the amount of timber that is used for manufacture or other useful human purposes, such as fuel, rather than wasted;
- develop measures that reduce the environmental impact of forest-based industries, to ensure that other pursuits may also flourish on Vancouver Island;
ensure that those who control forest-based wealth share it fairly in the form of taxes to local and provincial governments, Crown rents, wages and reinvestment.

We understand that to achieve these goals, forest employers must anticipate long-term opportunities for profit based on secure tenure. The forest employment Sector does not object to this as long as:

- the returns are shared with Islanders in the form of wages, taxes, rents and investment for the future;
- the highest possible standards of occupational and community health and safety are adhered to;
- workers and communities have opportunities to review and provide advice on major decisions before they are implemented;
- workers and communities are also warned of known potential problems or dangers;
- companies apply the highest possible standards of timber harvesting, forest ecology, reforestation, yield enhancement and preservation of air, land and water for other pursuits.

We are fully aware that too often in the past, government has allowed companies to work in ways that are not in keeping with these goals. Too often, companies intent on short-term profits have ignored the rules and abused our forests, our land, our water and our air. We will continue to expose and oppose these practices.

We are concerned about the current trend to reduce the working forest area. We believe the public has every right to insist that things are done properly within the working forest; the government has a responsibility to lay down strict guidelines and to enforce them, with respect to matters such as preservation of wildlife habitat, biodiversity, provision of riparian zones, preservation of streams, old growth values, choice of harvesting techniques, road building standards, etc. The public also has a right to expect that wood and fibre are used to ensure jobs and benefits to Islanders.

At the same time, we believe that our social and economic future is threatened by a growing move to withdraw lands from the working forest. We urge that CORE clearly define the working forest as a zone in which we encourage, subject to strict rules, the practice of sustainable forestry, based on the principles of ecological, sound harvesting techniques and reforestation.
Creation of a working forest zone would not imply the exclusion of others from enjoyment of many forested areas. We believe that a working forest, characterized by trees in various stages of the growth cycle and interspersed with small working cutblocks, is perfectly compatible with a wide variety of recreational uses and other pursuits.

If this commitment is made, we believe our forests will continue to create wealth, employment and pleasure for us, our fellow citizens of this glorious Island and future generations. This is our fondest hope and our main objective in these talks.
FOREST INDUSTRY INDEPENDENTS
INTEREST STATEMENT

Forest Independents are an extremely diverse group -- from a large, private sawmill with 400 employees to a one man woodlot operator. We are independent, local harvesters and processors of forest-derived products. Our collective need is for access to harvestable trees from forests which are managed sustainably, maintaining and perpetuating the diversity of all forest values, both for present and future generations.

We have a wide diversity of size, interests and abilities, which in concert provide our Sector with the flexibility, resilience and responsiveness to survive and flourish in this ever changing world. The needs and values of our communities can be met through the carefully planned application of the capabilities of our Sector.

Interests include:

- Ensuring all forest products flow naturally to their highest and best end use.
- A secure land base managed using the highest standard of forest ecosystem management. This should allow for the management of the largest land base possible.
- We support an empowerment of all local interests in the planning stage of forest management which provides an equitable opportunity for involvement.
- Continuity of employment and community stability will be given a high priority when changes to land use planning are contemplated.
- We recommend a planning process which maximizes the retention of all good site forest land for the growing of forests. Conversion of this land to other uses must be restricted.
FOREST MANAGERS AND MANUFACTURERS SECTOR
SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS

NOTE

The Interest Statement dated April 19, 1993, presented to the Vancouver Island CORE Table by the Forest Managers and Manufacturers is attached to this document. Following the outline suggested by the Table, the statement describes the needs, desires, concerns, fears and hopes of our group.

This document provides background on how Forest Managers and Manufacturers on Vancouver Island see the resource with which we are dealing and the commercial environment in which our companies must operate. It also amplifies some of the points made in the statement.

Halfway through the CORE regional negotiations, the Forest Managers and Manufacturers are increasingly concerned by a measurable imbalance between the high priority given to environmental factors and the lesser emphasis being placed by the process on the social and economic dimensions of land use issues. If this imbalance is not corrected, the Commission will be unable to achieve decisions that truly harmonize the environmental, social and economic values that are central to its legislated mandate.

Why Should We Continue Harvesting Wood on Vancouver Island?

Wood is an appropriate product for Vancouver Island to produce for three reasons: it is a uniquely versatile material; it is in increasing demand around the world; and it is a fully renewable resource.

There is so much wood around us in our daily lives that we can easily lose sight of what an amazing material it is. We make an enormous range of useful things out of wood: buildings, boats, books, newspapers, clothing, furniture, carpets, fences, tools, toys and shoes.

Leaving aside the use of wood for heating and cooking in many countries, each year the population of our planet requires an additional 48 million\(^1\) cubic meters of wood to meet increasing demand for products such as the ones listed above and for basic commodities such as lumber, pulp and paper. That's about twice the amount of wood harvested each year on the B.C. coast.

Vancouver Island has ideal climate and soils for growing such economically prized species as western cedar, Douglas fir and western hemlock. Forest managers cannot adjust the weather, but they can ensure that the soil retains its productivity by taking care to keep erosion to a minimum when building and maintaining roads, and by utilizing harvesting

---

\(^1\)Source: 1991 projection by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The lower number provides to the Vancouver Island CORE Table on May 13/93 was based on less current information.
techniques such as clearcutting that help return to the soil natural nutrients and species that cannot survive under dense forest canopies.

Why Harvest Wood?

The reality of our B.C. forests is that they grow back, even under conditions that seem daunting to the layperson. Forests will regenerate after being buried beneath kilometres of ice for thousands of years, after they have been burned off by forest fires hot enough to make individual trees explode, and after they have been clearcut in blocks the size of small towns.

Slash on the ground in a clearcut, whether it is left to rot or burned off, is not wasted wood. The parts of a tree that are not shaped into lumber, chipped for pulp or used to power a hot fuel boiler are allowed to return their nutrients to the soil, feeding the next generation of timber. The soil is also enriched by the remains of faster-growing plant species that spring up in new clearcuts, then eventually die off when a mature forest is re-established.

Forest managers can speed up nature's timetable for regeneration by planting seedlings, and the industry now plants 13.2 million trees on Vancouver Island every year. On average, each tree cut on the Island is replaced by at least three seedlings: one that sprouts by natural regeneration, and two that are planted by hand.

The point is, the forests of Vancouver Island have been harvested commercially for more than 100 years. They can continue to be used indefinitely, so long as forest managers plan and execute their work in accordance with natural conditions and the evolving principles of sustainable forestry.

Three Important Features of Forestry in B.C.

What's right for a forest in one part of the world may well be wrong for a forest somewhere else. Just as differences in social and economic factors have lead to structural differences in various forest industries, differences in climate, terrain and soil types mean that forestry techniques that work fine in a southern U.S. pine plantation are not appropriate to a stand of Douglas fir on the coast of Vancouver Island.

This section deals with three special aspects of forest management in British Columbia: the existence of old-growth timber; the investment criteria that surrounds commercial operations; and the quality of our work force.
1. Old Growth

British Columbians have long been in the business of caring for and harvesting old growth forests. There are good reasons for continuing this policy - the most important being that there is not yet nearly enough second growth ready to be harvested. The forest industry cannot make the transition from first to second growth until well into the next century.

In addition, the operations and equipment established by the forest industry on the coast are designed for the large trees that are characteristic of old growth. The mills and logging systems now in operation were intended to be used to harvest old growth over the next 20 to 50 years, while second growth timber reaches a size that will make it suitable for harvest. It is essential that companies be allowed to utilize old growth as they proceed with their planned and orderly conversion to a regime under which second growth becomes the sole object of harvesting and processing.

The decisions to invest in existing mills and equipment was predicted on continuing access to old growth timber.

Our perspective is that a social contract exists between the forest companies and the public owners of the resource. British Columbia's forest companies have risked and invested some $9 billion to build facilities on Vancouver Island and the adjacent mainland with the understanding that the Province would allocate sufficient stocks of the Island's old growth to be harvested and processed. Many communities were established on the strength of this contract.

And finally, old growth has an intrinsic commercial value greater than that of second growth. Because old growth can be turned into goods that have added value - such as decorative wood products like molding, siding and windows - it offers more opportunities for economic development and the creation of skilled jobs.

2. Investment Criteria

British Columbia's coastal forest often grow on extremely rough terrain, at considerable distances from processing facilities, and almost always at a great distance from the end users of the industry's products. Consequently, the industry encounters higher operating costs than its competitors in many other parts of the world.

To compensate for this competitive disadvantage, while still being able to provide well paying jobs and a financial contribution to government and society as a whole, the industry must invest heavily in the best technology for harvesting and processing forest products.
But the capital needed to finance investment in technology must also be competed for, often against other global investment opportunities that entail less risk to the shareholder or lender. To be able to raise the funds that make economic development in B.C. possible, the forest industry needs an operating climate that reduces risk and reduces the unpredictability of investing in the forest Sector.

- Size and Scope of Land Base

A key factor in maintaining a positive investment climate is the assurance of a large forest land base that can supply enough timber for the world-scale processing facilities already built, and allow for harvesting practices that are sustainable.

Assuring the availability of a large working forest does not preclude government from creating protected areas presenting up to 12 per cent of the forest land within the Province. It does not deny that a forest have other values beyond timber harvesting, nor does it envision a forest without a wide diversity of plant and animal life.

But, in order to sustain all of these values, the working forest must be large enough to accommodate many different kinds of users and uses. The more forest zoning and practices requirements effectively diminish production within the working forest, the wider the boundary of that forest will have to be to ensure the stability of the commercial operations that rely upon it.

- Tenure

Another crucial factor in encouraging investment in the forest industry is the security of forest land tenure, and the terms and costs under which tenure is held. Investors recognize that the longer the period during which a company has the right to manage a forest, the more likely it is that the company will be able to yield a competitive return on the money the investors risk.

- Predictability

Investors also look for predictability in the rules under which forest companies must operate. The backbone of responsible forest management is planning, and because forests require decades to renew themselves - harvesting, reforestation and stand tending must be planned for the very long term.
Planning must also take account of a wide range of variables including wildlife, recreation, fisheries and trapping - to name but a few - and five different levels of planning: provincial, regional, community, watershed and the stand itself. There are challenges of access involving putting roads, bridges, and stream crossings into difficult terrain. As well, cutting plans must be shaped to accommodate the location of timber, the species patterns, the type of mill to be supplied, and an ever changing mix of environmental and social values.

Intertwined with all of these on-site variables are the myriad of rules and regulations within which forest planners must think and work. The resulting matrix of imperatives and constraints - the "do's and don'ts" - is complex and demanding; but it can be worked with, so long as it remains predictable.

For all of these reasons, the industry's forest managers wish to see operating rules that are clear, commercially feasible and publicly supported. If the rules must change, the changes should be made gradually, and they should be well understood in terms of their effects on all members of the forest community. For example, if regulators intend to add wildlife preserves, they should consider their effect not only on the wildlife, but on other forest stakeholders including workers, companies and communities.

- Balance and Access

The process that changes the rules governing forest management should be realistic and balanced, and all stakeholders should be able to participate.

Unfortunately, this fundamental principle is not always respected here in B.C. For example, in the formulation of the Protected Areas Strategy - a policy which, incidentally, forest companies on Vancouver Island strongly support - the industry's forest managers were not invited to participate until very late in the process. A similar lack of access to the process of change now seems to be taking place in the development of a new code of forest practices. The Ministries and their consultants have been writing the code for more than a year, yet the people who must actually carry out these new forest practices have not been allowed a meaningful opportunity to participate.

- Clarity

Forest managers would also appreciate a set of rules without "grey areas", so that operations could be carried out within a clear regulatory framework, without the operator having to appeal continually to the regulator for a judgment on this or that technical question or issue.
Fees paid to government for the use of publicly owned timber also affect the profitability of operations; the higher the payment to government, the more risk that the investor's return will not be competitive.

The industry does not quarrel with government's right to establish a fair price for the private use of a public resource. But it asks that changes to fees and land use terms be made with a strategic appreciation of market conditions. Those who invest in the forest Sector are aware of its cyclical nature; they invest for the long term, trusting that a stable regulatory regime will underlie the fluctuations of the industry's business cycle.

Another force for good or ill in the forest industry's investment climate is the taxation regime. The industry recognizes that it should pay a fair price for the use of a public resource and a fair share of taxes. But, to strengthen its ability to operate competitively and return a profit to investors, the industry would prefer to see government take its taxes more from net income and less from property values or business transactions.

- Global Factors

The final factor to be borne in mind when considering the forest industry's investment climate is that it is a global climate. B.C. forest companies must compete against an entire world of other investment opportunities, including the bonds and treasury bills offered by many of the same governments whose decisions affect forest operations. To buy the equipment needed to meet legal standards for harvesting practices and effluent emissions, the industry must be able to show an appropriate return to investors.

3. The Quality of the Work Force

One of the B.C. forest industry's competitive strengths is the quality of its work force. British Columbia's highly skilled forest workers use first-class equipment or produce products that have to compete against foreign producers who often pay lower wages and taxes and who may get their wood at lower prices. Their skills and productivity are a major factor in the industry's ability to pay good wages.
The key is to build on these strengths. This will require the recognition that B.C.'s forest work force can continue to compete with lower-cost areas only as long as the operating and regulatory environment in the Province enables companies to introduce technologies and training programs that will enable the industry to make the most of its human capital. Investment in both human and manufacturing resources simply cannot be forthcoming in the absence of rules and regulations which allows forest managers to harvest and regenerate the resource in a sound and practical way.

A Diversified Economy and Strong Communities

The philosophical basis of the CORE process is that we are all dependent upon each other and recognize that our mutual interdependence will encourage us to share decision making, rather than to deal with each other through legislative or judicial processes.

The forest industry recognizes that it is but one component of British Columbia’s complex, dynamic economy and society, and forest managers are working with all other stakeholders in resolving questions of land use on Vancouver Island.

The industry also values the contributions made to its operations and to the well-being of its employees by British Columbians who produce goods and services in all sectors of the economy. Agriculture, fisheries, tourism, mining and local suppliers are valued participants in the diversified economy we desire.

Forest companies could not function effectively without strong, stable communities that provide the quality of life and the social safety net required to attract and keep the highly skilled employees who make our operations competitive. The industry has no wish to find itself as the sole taxpayer or the single economic engine of any community. The reasons are not just financial; a cyclical industry cannot, by itself, provide the continuity and social stability upon which community life depends.

Public Support

The development of British Columbia’s forest resource has taken place under a partnership between industry and the public. The forest companies were awarded long-term access to publicly owned forests on the basis that they build facilities that generated jobs and revenue for communities and government. Today, the partnership continues. But social and economic change has brought us to the point where the public must clarify whether and under what conditions it wishes to carry on with this relationship.
Bluntly put, if the people of British Columbia, through their elected government, want to receive an economic return on their forest resource - if they want to continue to take advantage of Vancouver Island's well established position as a reliable supplier of wood products the world is willing to buy - then they must understand the economic realities of the forest Sector, and endorse conditions that will enable it to operate competitively.

In recent years, the forest industry and its work force have not received the support they need from government and general public. This is partially because the industry's past environmental performance has not always met public expectations. And is partially because growth in urban centres has meant more and more British Columbians tend to be less aware of the linkage between the health of the forest industry and their well-being than people in regional communities who experience firsthand the impact of lay-offs and plant closures.

Whatever the reasons for it, this situation must change. To survive and prosper the forest industry in this Province needs support from people without as well as within resource-based communities. That support must be based on a mature understanding of how forest management really works and on sound forest management performance in the field. People must understand that, although stumps are not beautiful and fresh clearcuts will never be photogenic, we are not eliminating the forests of this Province - they will, and do, come back.

A daycare, a hospital, a community college, and the Parliament Buildings all have one thing in common - they are examples of deforestation. So is a hundred square kilometres of South American rain forest destroyed to create agricultural land.

But a Vancouver Island clearcut, whether it be replanted or allowed to regenerate naturally, is not deforestation. It was forest land before the trees were cut, and it is forest land after they are cut. The forest is being renewed.

Public support for the forest also requires that British Columbians care about the economies of the forest Sector. Demand for lumber, pulp and paper goes up and down in accordance with the ebb and flow of the world economy. So do the prices for forest products.

British Columbians cannot control markets or prices; they can, however, control the operating and investment climate here at home. Decisions on regulation and tax regimes will ultimately determine whether British Columbia's forest Sector can continue to hold its own against international competition.
Balancing Environmental, Economic and Social Values

In recent decades, governments and most British Columbians have realized that it makes sense to build a diversified provincial economy in which the forest Sector will be of decreasing importance. The forest industry supports and understands that goal, although it wishes to see it accomplished by the building up of other Sectors, rather than by shrinking the forest operations.

One intent of the CORE process is to foster diversity in our resource-dependent economy by balancing environmental, economic and social priorities. Forest managers are already well in tune with that intent, having spent decades managing forests for multiple values. Managing to preserve wildlife and diversity of plant and animal species is far from new to professional foresters; it is a core value of the modern science of forestry.

The industry's forest managers are long accustomed to cooperating with people who come into the public forests as conservationists, tourists and commercial and recreational users. The industry anticipates no difficulty in continuing to cooperate, although it would like to see all users subjected to comparable rules of stewardship, and to see the public benefit from comparable resource rents.

Conclusions

The interests of the forest industry overlap those of other British Columbians who have a stake in the forest lands of Vancouver Island. The overlapping of interests creates a common need to:

- define a land base on which the forest industry can operate and complete the provincial Protected Areas Strategy;

- create a regulatory regime which respects other needs and values but gives forest managers the freedom to manage, and;

- assist the people of British Columbia in understanding and supporting sustainable development of their forest resources.
1. **Needs**

- Continue to operate.
- Diverse economies both in the communities and in the more rural parts of the Island.
- Stable and strong communities that understand and are supportive of our industry.
- Highly skilled and supportive work force.
- An understanding and supportive public and government who will accept our industry and promote our forest management practices on a local, regional and global basis.
- Provincial policy which recognizes the need for the B.C. forest industry to compete in the global marketplace.
- Operating rules and planning processes which provide predictable and realistic operating standards and conditions and which empower the industry to manage in an economically, environmentally and socially responsible way.
- Maintain a designated land area of productive forest land sufficient to provide adequate and predictable fibre supplies over the long term. This working forest will include areas where commercial timber production will not take place, or areas where it may be restricted by practices necessary to ensure the sustainability of forest ecosystems. The non-productive areas are described on the attached list. Our best estimate of the amount of public forest lands we require to sustain the Vancouver Island forest Sector and its stakeholders is 1,500,000 hectares of which roughly 50% are old growth and 50% are second and third growth.
- Having achieved the land base referred to in the preceding paragraph, we need security of tenure based on stability and predictability with respect to both cost and regulations affecting planning and operations. (We all recognize that this stability and predictability must be balanced with the interests of both industry and the public to adjust the regulatory regime to changing circumstances and changing understanding.)
- Remain competitive as to quality, cost and reliability and in providing products responsive to customer demands in the competitive global marketplace.
2. **Desires**

- Government and public recognizes the value of wood as an environmentally friendly material in meeting the expanding needs of the world's rapidly growing population.

- Government and public recognize the unique nature of the forest industry and its renewable raw material source and its ability to sustain economic, environmental and social values.

- Strike an appropriate balance between economic, environmental and social aspects and do forestry work to these standards.

- Company/employee/union working relationships which ensure management, harvesting, manufacturing and marketing of forests and forest products in a manner which protects the environment and the range of forest values while providing good working conditions and an equitable distribution of revenues and returns among employees, government and shareholders.

- Government/industry/labour joint initiatives develop further opportunities for extracting more value from the forest harvest.

- Native peoples increase their involvement in the forest industry.

- Clearly define and publicly support integrated management objectives for all forest resources.

- Clearly define, ecologically appropriate, cost effective and publicly supported forest management practices.

- Public policies and regulations which create conditions favourable to private Sector investment in forestry.
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- Timely completion of the government's protected areas strategy to meet the provincial goal of 12% protected areas.

- Impact of change is effectively managed through transition and mitigation plans which are sensible, effective and deliverable.

- Public support for increased government reinvestment in the management of public forests through enhanced forestry.

- Be a part of society's solutions to problems by being active participants, along with other stakeholders, in public policy-making.

3. Concerns

- Government policy which does not recognize the globally competitive nature of the forest products industry.

- Government and public failure to recognize the long-term nature of forest management decisions especially the connections between the land, old growth, allowable annual cut and investment in forestry.

- Government and public misunderstanding of the need for industry to continue to access old growth.

- Piecemeal development of regulations which does not recognize the cumulative impacts on forest practices and the economic and social results.

- Policies and regulations developed in isolation without regard to achieving balance among economic, environmental and social values.

- Exclusion of industry from meaningful participation in policy-making.

- Insufficient understanding of the needs and concerns of resource based communities.

- Regulatory focus on other values results in timber production being left with a residual land base.

- Policy development not based on appropriate application of scientific principles and experiences.
4. **Fears**
   
   - Government failure to recognize the global nature of the forest products industry and the long term nature of forest management will lead to progressive declines in the competitiveness of the industry and subsequent impacts on communities and investment and on government's ability to sustain and enhance existing social programs.
   
   - Unsupported belief in "value-added" as a practical solution to mitigation and overcome falling cut levels.
   
   - Policy which does not recognize the environmental desirability of clear-cut harvesting techniques for most B.C. forests.
   
   - Ad hoc guideline development which through the cumulative effect of incremental change curtails the ability of industry to operate efficiently, imposes unrealistic constraints on management and removes additional large areas of productive forest land which are additional to the 12% protected area provincial goal.
   
   - Continuing increases in public indebtedness that jeopardize not only the social safety net but also the stability of Canadian society.

5. **Hopes**
   
   - Through innovative land zoning, tenure systems, operating rules, forestry and logging practices and investment, it will be possible to increase the harvest and support an industry larger than the present.
   
   - Forest management practices which will continue to evolve and will become recognized as world class by the public and by our customers, while reflecting the economic realities imposed on us by the international marketplace.
   
   - Industry's demonstrated willingness to change will increase public support and lead to favourable government policies which will favour better forest management and more competitive market positioning.
   
   - Future change will be facilitated by negotiations rather than confrontation.
   
   - Investments in B.C. forest Sector will be sustained and increased over time.
Lands designated for protection are set aside through a rational process which results in minimum disruption to the forest Sector yet protects representative ecosystems and landscapes.

Public commitment for zoning of land through forestry uses that will be strong enough to encourage investment in forestry.
GENERAL EMPLOYMENT SECTOR
INTEREST STATEMENT

The General Employment Sector represents approximately 19,000 workers on Vancouver Island. We live in virtually every community on the Island and we work in a wide variety of occupations in both the private and the public sectors. We are concerned about our future well-being, and the well being of our children and our children's children. We understand that healthy environments, viable communities, and healthy economies are necessary, for that future well-being.

The General Employment Sector believes that CORE can have a significant impact on the well-being of our members. Therefore, we are participating as a large group of people in a wide variety of occupations from all over the Island with an important stake in the future of Vancouver Island.

We believe the environment and resources of Vancouver Island belong to all the people of the Island and not to any particular sector. We view the CORE process as a change to cooperate with the other people of Vancouver Island in determining our best sustainable future.

Ecological Sustainability

Without functioning ecosystems, life on the planet is impossible. So, obviously, ecological sustainability is of fundamental interest to us at the CORE table. Because regional ecosystems are inextricably linked to the global ecosystems, we recognize our responsibility to the rest of the world to ensure Vancouver Island's ecosystems function robustly. We understand, as well, the reciprocal responsibility of the rest of world to ensure that their ecosystems remain healthy. Thus, we endorse the principle in CORE's Land Use Charter. "The Province shall recognize its responsibility to protect the global environment, to reduce consumption to sustainable levels, to avoid importing or exporting ecological stresses, and to help meet the global challenge of sustainably supporting the human population."

Abundant clean air, water, viable soils and biodiversity are essential for ecological sustainability, and we seek to ensure that they are maintained and enhanced. We agree with the statement in CORE's proposed Land Use Charter. "The Province shall maintain and enhance the life supporting capacity of air, land and ecosystems." As part of this goal

---
of enhancing our biological life support systems, we support the goal of protecting, in as pristine condition as possible, 12% of each representative ecosystem.

We agree with the CORE Land Use Charter that "A healthy environment is the foundation upon which a sound economy and society depend."  

**Societal Sustainability**

Sustaining our societies is plainly critical and, thus, of fundamental interest at the CORE table. The Commission uses the term "sustainable society" to mean "capable of being maintained indefinitely". This is an inadequate definition. The World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED - Bruntland Commission) used a more appropriate definition, "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". The WCED definition contains a commitment to future generations that is absent in CORE's definition. Societies capable of being maintained indefinitely can vary in quality. We do not want our legacy to be societies that are sustainable but impoverished: their people wanting all but the barest necessities. The WCED concept of not "compromising" the ability of future generations to provide for themselves is critical. We agree with the statement in the Land Use Charter proposed by CORE. "Finally, the Province shall ensure that present-day decisions do not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own environmental and economic needs."

**Community Sustainability**

For the most part, we enjoy living on Vancouver Island. We want the resources of Vancouver Island dedicated to maintaining and enhancing the quality of our communities. Our members who work in health care and social services are the people called upon to deal with the ravages of instability. We are fully aware, therefore, of the importance of Vancouver Island communities remaining good places to work, raise families and recreate.

**Sustainable Local Economies**

Sustainable communities require viable economies. Within the context of ecological sustainability, we want the resources of Vancouver Island dedicated to maintaining stable community economies and quality local employment. Our members want meaningful jobs with decent pay and working conditions and understand that without these same standards for other workers there will be no stability in their communities.

---

It is possible that CORE will develop models of local economies and land-use decision making that could be applied to parallel local consultative and decision-making processes for health and social service delivery. We want input into the development of such local decision-making models.

Our members who work in resource and land use fields have interests in, knowledge of, and care deeply about their areas of work. Their views, in these areas, may differ from those of their employer and, if so, cannot be expressed while representing the employer. The Union is their best vehicle for the expression of these views. Where the subject of our members comment is not confidential information, our participation in CORE provides an opportunity for them to freely express themselves on a number of topics about which they have considerable expertise.

Although CORE is not intended to replace line ministry functions or decision-making authority, the potential exists for ministry mandates to change as a result of the process. We want input into decisions affecting us as resource and environment stewards, for example - changes in local decision-making processes and monitoring or regulatory responsibilities. In particular, our members in the Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks, the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources, the Ministry of Forests, the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, and the Ministry of Tourism possess considerable knowledge of issues relevant to CORE as well as their concerns as workers living in Vancouver Island communities.

A Vision: Vancouver Island In the Year 2020

Victoria is the largest urban centre on the Island. It is relatively small, congenial city which has maintained its early 1990's ambiance. People still walk, unafraid, bathed in sunlight, on the streets between low rise, heritage buildings.

Automobile traffic in and out of the city is modest: most commuters use the electric rail systems to destinations on the Saanich Peninsula and up island to the Cowichan Valley.

On the rest of the Island, people live in medium and small sized towns and their adjacent rural areas as they did in 1992. Islanders enjoy this atmosphere, low population density, low pollution levels, low crime rates, abundant water, and stable but modern economies. Because we have controlled our population growth, we haven't incurred excessive infrastructure costs, and our taxes, therefore, are relatively low. We enjoy, also, ready access to outdoor recreation - on the ocean, lakes and rivers, and mountains and wilderness areas.
A large portion of the Island, including the vast privately held forest lands that covered most of the south east quarter of the Island in 1992, is in a fiercely protected Forest Land Reserve (FLR) and is in the commercial forest. Most of these lands are under integrated resource management: some are dedicated solely to commercial forest use. Many of these lands are open to mining, but strict environmental guidelines apply. Strict forest practices regulations apply to all forest lands on the Island - private and public. Urban boundaries are clearly identified and strictly enforced.

Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) lands are protected equally fiercely and urban incursions have been a thing of the past for nearly 3 decades.

Vancouver Island has a protected areas systems that includes more than 12% of each representative ecosystem. In 1992 less than 12% of some ecosystems remained unmodified. In these cases modified blocks have been protected so that over time they can reacquire old growth characteristics. All species extant in 1992 have been protected in habitats sufficiently large to be sustainable. On the west coast of the Island a number of significant intact watersheds have been protected. These protected areas are not available to the resource extraction industries.

All of the timber harvested on Vancouver Island is processed here to some degree, and most wood products consumed on the Island are produced here. Small metal smelters and refineries, foundries and machine shops exist on the Island now, as well. Many salmon spawning streams have been rehabilitated, and our commercial fishing industry thrives. Also, we have a prosperous food products industry, which produces virtually all of the processed products from our farmers and fishers. Tourism is a major industry: in particular, tourists flock to the many outdoor recreation and wilderness experiences available on and about Vancouver Island.

One of the significant impacts of free trade is the removal of a regions' or a nations ability to control its own environmental, social and economic destiny. Useful economic tools like tariffs and buy local policies are forbidden under a free trade regime. Fortunately, free trade has long since disappeared and we on the Island have gained a significant measure of control over our economy and our environment. Consequently, we are free to trade but not dependent on trade. We have complex multi-level economies which provide a wide range of economic opportunities for our citizens.
Rather than measuring the quality of production (GNP), which correlates poorly with economic welfare, we now assess economic welfare directly. This assessment is based on refined Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare, first described by Herman Daly and John Cobb Jr. in 1989\(^1\). The depletion of non-renewable resources, loss of farmlands, loss of wetlands, cost of commuting, costs of urbanization, pollution control costs, and many health care costs, are considered as negative impacts on economic welfare and or sustainability.

Vancouver Island's human carrying capacity has been identified: we are informed about the trade-off's between population and per capita consumption, given today's technology. As citizens of the Island, we decided on a standard of living similar to that which people had in 1992, and we created social and economic mechanisms which sustain us within Vancouver Islands biophysical carrying constraints. As a result, despite severe constraints on growth, unemployment is low, and life on the Island is affordable, humanely scaled, enjoyable and to the best of our knowledge is sustainable.

---

1 Daly, Herman and Cobb, John Jr. 1989: For the Common Good, Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment and a Sustainable Future: Beacon Press
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INTRODUCTION

This statement of interest has been produced by the members of the government Sector's Regional Steering Group for the Vancouver Island regional process, and represents the results of ongoing dialogue among senior staff of government agencies involved with regional program delivery on Vancouver Island. At this point, it is informed solely by input from the Regional Steering Group supporting the Island Table.

Government has a unique three-faceted role at the Table in that it participates as a Sector with interests in the negotiation, is responsible for review and approval of the Table's recommendations, and must develop, fund and implement the final determination (plan).

This interest statement reflects not only the goals of current initiatives and programs but also those of long-established provincial objectives.

KEY OBJECTIVES

The principle goal of government is to convert the aspirations of the people of this Province into sustainable land management policies and programs. A range of current and long-standing objectives exist to reach this goal, some of which are:

- To manage, protect and enhance provincial land and resources and communities of Vancouver Island to achieve sustainable social and economic benefits and an optimum quality of life.

- To encourage Aboriginal participation in land and resource planning and management.

- To allocate and manage Crown land (including foreshore) and Crown resources for the economic, social and environmental benefit of all people in the Province, now and in the future.

- To protect and manage provincial parks and ecological reserves and other such destinations.

- To ensure a fair return to the Crown for use of public assets.

- To encourage and enhance productivity of the forest land base.

- To promote education and awareness of the public on the environment, resources, health and economy.
• To provide and maintain provincial transportation system involving ground, air and marine transportation.

• To ensure rural growth is managed in an orderly fashion through provision of the rural land area subdivision approval process.

• To ensure a power supply to meet the needs of Island residents, communities and industries.

• To maintain a social safety net for British Columbians during times of need, based on community, security, responsibility, opportunity, sustainability, partnership and dialogue.

• To develop effective programs to remove barriers created by job loss.

• To promote and support regional economic development and diversification.

• To improve competitiveness and maximize value-added use of resources.

• To facilitate increased trade, exports and wealth creation in the region.

• To work with local governments, community groups and residents to identify and address local health issues related to social, economic and environmental factors.

WHY ARE WE INVOLVED IN THE NEGOTIATION?

There are a number of reasons why the government accepted the opportunity to sit at the regional Table as an active participant in the planning negotiations. Prime reasons are identified below:

• An opportunity to improve public understanding of the objectives and impacts of new government resource initiatives, such as the Protected Areas Strategy.

• An opportunity to provide a more precise definition of a sustainable society for Vancouver Island, and a better understanding of what achieving sustainability means or entails for the Island.
An opportunity to provide for greater resource industry stability and predictability, particularly through programs to encourage better management of resources for sustainability.

An opportunity to show international leadership in the development of new and creative planning models through a shared decision-making process.

An opportunity to cooperatively create a comprehensive and proactive social and economic transition strategy to assist in dealing with the impacts of land use change.

An opportunity to obtain dialogue and valuable feedback on government policies and programs related to land and resource planning, and to identify emerging issues which may require government attention.

An opportunity to maintain awareness at the Table of government's fiscal and economic constraints, so that the Table's recommendations are in keeping with the public's ability to pay.

**GAINS AND LOSSES**

As a Sector at the Table, government and its representative agencies realize that the success or failure of the planning process will have an effect on regional program delivery. Agencies have identified key areas of gain and loss as a consequence of the success and failure (respectively) of the CORE regional planning exercise.

- We gain the opportunity to better explain government programs and policies in the region, and to receive critical feedback for improvements. Failure of the regional negotiation would cause reversion to more conventional public consultation processes on policy initiatives.

- The potential stability and certainty in land use resulting from success of the regional process will result in less conflict among agency client groups and fewer challenges from the public in the conduct of agency programs. Failure of the process would likely mean continued difficulties by agencies in satisfying the many divergent public and interest group perspectives on land and resource management.

- We gain an opportunity to improve the level and quality of information on local and regional communities, economy and the environment. The process is driving a demand for better information and for more rigorous analysis for regional and subsequent planning activities. Failure of the process may reduce the incentive to fund subsequent inventory and studies.
We hope to gain a mechanism for accelerating processes to designate land for various purposes, including the Protected Areas Program and other initiatives.

The process provides the momentum for new and integrated policies and strategies that are regionally sensitive. Failure of the process may lead to less creative proposals from the public, and existing policies and programs will fail to benefit from review and testing.

The regional process is providing government agencies with the motivation to integrate objectives, streamline planning and decision-making, and respond to issues and work in a more corporate fashion. Failure of the process may result in a return to the often counter-productive Sectoral advocacy approach by agencies.

Success of the regional process provides regional agencies with a useful interagency structure for shared resource planning and decision-making inside government.

If the process succeeds, we gain needed guidance and direction to more detailed levels of land planning and resource management by provincial and local government. Failure would require much greater time and resources to be allocated for development of operational-level planning.

If the process fails, we will have lost considerable investment in agency money and staff time in a period of diminished operational budgets, which could have been effectively spent on other government programs.

COMMITMENTS

A number of key commitments have already been made by government which have impact on these negotiations and regional land and resource allocation and management. These are identified below:

- A commitment to a government-to-government forum for First Nations treaty negotiations, and a commitment to joint consultation and stewardship as interim measures.

- A commitment to implement the Protected Areas Strategy by doubling the amount of land in protected area status in B.C. to a 12% target.
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- A commitment to preserve the public trust by respecting existing park and ecological reserve boundaries where these boundaries have recently undergone rigorous public review processes.

- A commitment to apply interim management guidelines in official PAS study areas to protect natural resources and attributes while evaluation for protected area status is taking place.

- A commitment to a three year review of the annual allowable cut in Timber Supply Areas.

- Protection and maintenance of the Agricultural Land Reserve.

- A commitment to respect existing, approved inter-agency resource plans and decisions developed using a rigorous public involvement and review process.

LAND DESIGNATION

Our Sector recognizes the importance of establishing a logical land designation system and its component parts within the planning area. Key elements of a land designation system necessary to address government's interests are identified below:

- There is a preference for a few basic categories of use, ranging along the spectrum of use from protected natural areas to single focus, intensively used settlement areas.

- As the primary implementers of the regional plan, government agencies believe there should be consistency in the land designation system employed by the three regional Tables. If no such uniformity can be achieved, then each category must be well-defined in terms of its intent, approved activities and other prescriptions to allow comparisons to be made.

- Land use designations must reference statements outlining the nature and purpose of subsequent, more detailed planning exercises and the appropriate planning forum.

- Land use designations must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate unknown future changes in land use practices or demands.

- The land designation system must incorporate a category for protected areas.

- Within the designation system, the allocation of land and water areas to priority or special uses should be based upon land/resource scarcity or high capacity.
The system must adequately address implementation, monitoring and review of the CORE regional plan once it has been completed and approved by government.

The designations must address the special management requirements of community watersheds. Where possible, community watersheds should be identified for special management and protection.

The need for accommodation of transportation and utilities uses must be considered within each land designation, given the anticipated need for development of infrastructure to support economic diversity and community stability.

The land allocation exercise must consider solutions to the challenges presented by rapid urban growth, particularly on the Island's eastern coast, and the resultant pressures on land, environment, and resources such as water.

The land allocation exercise of the Table must consider the impact of its recommendations for public land on resource lands held under private ownership, given the significance of management practices on private land, the extent of such land, and its impact on communities and local government.
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Goals and objectives for the Local Government Sector at the CORE Table as represented by the Association of Vancouver Island Municipalities.

OVERALL GOAL: Economically healthy and socially secure, sustainable communities.

OBJECTIVES
1. NEEDS
   • stable tax base
   • legislated water quality protection
   • capability to maintain services and improve amenities
   • recognition and respect for the security of existing rural and community based planning

2. DESIRES
   • expansion and preservation of tax base
   • direct input into what happens to land base
   • forest tenures linked to economic opportunities
   • community development

IMPLICATIONS
• need B.C. Assessment Authority data on changes to community tax rolls, current status and land analysis
• need information on capital budgets, and budget protections from member municipalities and regional districts
• need a set of economic models to test impact of projected shifts in employment patterns or introduction of new industries
• identify conflicts so that impact on local communities can be assessed
• necessary to know what the socio-economic impacts on communities is going to be
• need copies of provincial and local (both social and cultural) strategies for development of educational requirements
LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECTOR INTEREST STATEMENT
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- economic development

3. CONCERNS
- threats to community

- threats to infra-structure maintenance (roads, water, sewage, waste management, health services, etc.)
- costs of major adjustments to OCP's
- that transition strategies resulting from land decisions be realistic. Consistent with the capabilities of the labour force.

- need analysis of Stats Canada data on Vancouver Island demographic trends
- need to convene Island Economic Development Officers to survey current short and long term forecasts
- need to poll municipal Treasurers to determine recent local government revenue trends and spending patterns
- need for an articulation process in Vancouver Island communities for individuals and interest groups to identify quality of life changes that might result from CORE decisions
- need for local and regional public infra-structure, this to form data to analyze impacts of land use changes and costs of impacts
- need to have on hand all Vancouver Island official community plans for individual impact analysis as issues arise at the CORE Table

213
4. FEARS
- erosion of tax base and revenue sources
- depopulation of areas and destabilization of communities due to job loss and economic uncertainty
- loss or downgrading of amenities and services
- fear of loss of investor confidence in the local communities

5. HOPES
- development of a consensual process for land use decision making at the regional and local levels
- continued and improved environmental health balanced by preserving community quality of life
- as this section addresses a series of emotionally charged responses to perceived situations or decisions pending at the CORE Table, the need here is to rationalize these impacts with scientific data analysis
- in particular a set of reports needs to be developed which identify historic and ongoing trends, then isolate specific impacts of CORE decisions
- need for ongoing documentation of Table discussions, then networking this information throughout Vancouver Island communities
- need for parallel consensus building among local level interest groups
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- evolution of mutual understanding of Sectoral concerns

- that through this process, others will have confidence in the accessibility and responsiveness of Local Government to their concerns

- the need for better public information as to all aspects of land and resource management
MINING SECTOR
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The following are results of a limited polling of the Mining Sector to "flesh out" Mining Sector interests.

1. **What are the Mining Sectors' most important interests, in priority order?**

   (1) Certainty of land tenure.
   (2) Access to as much land as possible for exploration.
   (3) Clear, practical, science-based environmental rules.
   (4) Elimination of high fees or other non-profit based taxes.
   (5) To operate our mines safely and economically.
   (6) Resolution of native land claims.
   (7) A say in establishing regulations.

2. **What could we lose if this process does not succeed?**

   (1) Access to land.
   (2) Ownership of our claims and leases.
   (3) Loss of investor confidence.
   (4) Our jobs and our investments.
   (5) Jobs in the supply/support/service Sector which are several times the direct mining employment.
   (6) Revenue generation required for Province's social programs.
   (7) Competitiveness of our industry.
   (8) Part of our heritage.

3. **What do we think other Sectors' interests may be? Can we prioritize them? What Sector(s) share some sets of interests with us?**

   (1) Protection of biodiversity, endangered species, etc.
   (2) Protection of visual, aesthetic, values.
   (3) Protection of water quality.
   (4) Complete alienation of large areas.
   (5) Sustaining their communities.
   (6) Conservation of resources for future.
   (7) Maximizing of "downstream" processing.
   (8) Maximizing of tax revenues, fees, permit costs, etc.
   (9) Sustaining all resource extraction activities.
   (10) Access to other resources (timber, land, fish, etc.).
   (11) Maintaining of status quo - population, development, transportation systems, etc.
4. How will our knowledge of other Sectors' interests assist us in achieving our goals?

- May be able to meet their interests without compromising ours.
- They may be totally aligned with ours.
- Shared infrastructure could help in reducing costs to affected Sectors.
- Developing synergy's and alleviating conflicts.
- Integration of goals.

5. How have our Sector's interests changed over time and how might they change in the future?

- Increasing concerns over land access and security of tenure; might get worse.
- Reactionary interests (environment, safety, welfare) have resulted in increased costs which if not controlled will adversely affect the industry more than it already has.
- Increased desire to undertake "downstream processing" in B.C.
- Improving technologies of processing and control reducing environmental impacts - will likely continue.
- Increased recycling, wherein consumer shares in waste management (i.e. municipal land fill).
The Mining Sector is a much more complex group than the Forest Managers and Manufacturers Sector because it represents nearly 2000 constituents ranging from multi-national corporations to individual prospectors. It has a 150 year history on this Island, where mining was once the most prominent activity with 20,000 employees, compared with less than 2000 now. Many of our towns and cities such as Nanaimo, Ladysmith, Cumberland and Duncan were originally founded as mining towns.

Mining is also different from the forestry Sector in that it generates a wide variety of products. Those currently produced include copper, zinc, gold, silver, molybdenum, coal, limestone, building stone, sand and gravel and assorted minor minerals. Mining is also export oriented; virtually all of Vancouver Island’s mineral production is exported. Although the Mining Sector is modest in terms of provincial employment (about 0.5% directly and 1.5% combined direct, indirect and induced) and land area disturbed (about 0.08% of the total) it is significant economically. The Mining Sector is the top wage payer in the country, averaging over $61,000 per employee per year. It generates 4-5% of the gross provincial product, about 20% of B.C.’s export and over one half of provincial rail and sea freight. In fact it has been postulated that if it were not for mining, railways here would not likely exist.

Mining is also a profit-motivated Sector and we make no apology for that. Profits are the wages of investment capital and whether we know it or not, almost all of us are investors, direct or indirect, through share ownership or pension plans. We all depend on profits or the expectations for profits to generate investment, create employment and support social spending.

As mentioned earlier, mining disturbs a minuscule proportion of our land - and that only temporarily, prior to reclamation. Mining generates more economic benefits per unit area than any other non urban activity. Where ever viable mineral deposits are discovered, regulated mining is arguably the “highest and best use” of our land. But minerals are illusive, hidden resources, and difficult to find. In some sense they scarcely exist until they have been discovered and defined. The odds of a mineral claim or prospect becoming a mine are about 1:5000; correspondingly, each viable mine costs about $50 million to delineate and this typically takes more than 10 years.

With these probabilities and risks to contend with, it is not surprising that security of mineral land tenure is a major concern to our Sector. To put it simply land is the foundation on which exploration is based; exploration is the foundation on which mining is based; and mining is an integral component of the foundation on which much of our provincial economy is based.

We in the Mining Sector believe it is essential to convince you at this regional negotiation Table, as well as the rest of the public, that modern mining exploration is a benign, environmentally non-threatening, activity which anyone or any thing can live with. Because
of the hidden and highly site-specific nature of the resource, it is inappropriate to make
mining land use decisions on a regional basis. We believe that because mineral
exploration, claim staking and potentially mining are highly regulated, they should be
permitted virtually everywhere - even on lands that are off limits or protected for other more
obtrusive activities. Most land alienations currently affecting mining were created primarily
to address forest-related concerns; we need to address mining issues separately from
forestry ones.

The question then arises as to what to do about the rare case when a successful
exploration project moves toward mine development in a "protected area". As regional
zoning designations are not appropriate and can not logically be applied to subsurface
mineral resources, the mine proponent would make application to the mine assessment
review committee to redesignate from "protected area" status only that portion of the site
specific surface area of the claim and transportation route required for the purpose of
accessing, extracting and processing the subsurface resource. Such an application would
need to adequately address a wide variety of concerns and conflicts including potential
impacts on flora, fauna, water, other resource users, communities, etc. just as is done now.
However, under the Mining Sector proposal, the review process would be conducted in
open session at locations within the affected sub-regional communities. This review
process would be based on a multiple-accounts or value versus threat analysis and hear
from and consider local concerns. It is unlikely that a properly designed mining proposal
would be rejected after consideration of its high economic benefits. In those rare cases
where genuine incompatibility exists, the mine assessment review committee could
recommend expropriation of the mineral tenure upon payment of fair market value
compensation to the resource interest holder.
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COMMENTS
At this time, we would like to describe our interests from the level of our vision for Vancouver Island down to the level of the general values, landscape values, policy and management values, and kinds of landscapes that relate to our vision.

As a Sector, we have developed our interests to the level of a list of specific sites and specific management prescriptions. However, we feel such a level of specificity is not appropriate at the present.

Although we found words such as "needs, desires, concerns, fears, and hopes" helpful in exploring our interests, we discovered that stating our interests in final form in terms of those categories made it too easy to make positional or political statements. Accordingly, we have chosen not to state our interests in that way.

VISION
We have previously stated our vision at two levels of generality:

1. We envision that, as a result of our planning efforts, the Vancouver Island landscape will be beautiful, and will be capable of sustaining and renewing the human spirit.

2. We envision an integrated and harmonious relationship between human activity and the land of Vancouver Island, so that the human spirit may be sustained and renewed by the land, and so that the diversity and productivity of the land can be maintained, for its own sake, for human use and enjoyment, and for the future.

We hope our vision expresses a fundamental value we hold, which is the necessity of a spiritual relationship with the land.

GENERAL VALUES
We consider that the Land Use Charter expresses the general values of environmental, spiritual, social and economic sustainability that support our vision. We refer you to the Land Use Charter, rather than re-stating those values here.

We are also hopeful that the Vision being developed by the Table will continue to express the same values.

LANDSCAPE VALUES
We are interested in landscapes having these values in varying degrees:

1. NATURALNESS
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2. REMOTENESS

3. SCENIC QUALITIES

4. ACCESSIBILITY

5. SPECIAL QUALITIES SUCH AS PRESENCE OF FISH, GAME, OR OTHER WILDLIFE, OR CHALLENGING TERRAIN.

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT VALUES
We are interested in policy and management tools that produce these results:

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRINCIPLES EMBODIES IN THE LAND USE CHARTER.

2. INTEGRATION OF RECREATIONAL VALUES WITH OTHER RESOURCE VALUES.

3. PRESERVATION, ENHANCEMENT, OR RESTORATION OF NATURAL AND RECREATIONAL VALUES, OR OF SPECIAL NATURAL OR RECREATIONAL FEATURES.

4. CONTAINMENT OF THE IMPACTS OF HUMAN ACTIVITY ON THE LANDSCAPE.

5. ACCESS TO, AND MANAGEMENT FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF, RECREATIONAL RESOURCES.

KINDS OF LANDSCAPES
We are interested in preservation and management of the following kinds of landscapes:

1. NATURAL AREAS OF SUFFICIENT SIZE TO ALLOW AN EXTENDED WILDERNESS RECREATIONAL EXPERIENCE.

2. RECREATIONAL CORRIDORS.

3. AREAS REPRESENTATIVE OF UNDISTURBED ECOSYSTEMS.

4. WILDLIFE HABITAT.
5. RIVERS, ESTUARIES, AND RIPARIAN CORRIDORS.

6. WETLANDS.

7. LAKES.

8. COASTLINES.

9. CAVES, POTHOLES, AND KARST TERRAIN.

10. ALPINE AND SUBALPINE.

11. SPECIAL AREAS NECESSARY TO RARE OR ENDANGERED SPECIES.

12. SPECIAL AREAS OF PARTICULAR SCENIC INTEREST.

13. AGRICULTURAL LAND AND THE WORKING FOREST.
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY SECTOR
INTEREST STATEMENT

Needs, Desires, Concerns, Fears, Hopes

NEEDS
- Accountability of Vancouver Island Regional Table of CORE to communities affected
- Equitable distribution of impacts
- Sustainable resource management
- Sustainable communities
- Sustainable employment
- Balanced, practical, workable outcome, not driven by emotion or theatrics

DESIREs
- Maintain choice to live in rural community with realistic standard of living
- Sufficient economic base
- Opportunities for overall economic growth
- Adaptability to change
- Diversification of economy
- Examination of current land use allocations
- Satisfactory resolution of land claims

CONCERNS
- Sufficient time for transition
- Accountability of CORE to communities
- Sufficient attention given to social/economic concerns
- Unique cultural heritage of resource-based employment may not be sufficiently valued

FEARS
- Not enough funding available to deal with potential impacts on communities
- Social/economic analysis will be left to the end and receive inadequate attention

HOPES
- Improved infrastructure to deal with growth
- Improved standard of living
- Improved quality of life
- More jobs from sustainability managed forests
- Consistent, enduring cooperation between interest groups on current and future land use decisions
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY SECTOR
(Statement to the Table Explaining our Interests the Template Refers to)

This statement from the Social and Economic Sustainability Sector will help the Vancouver Island Commission on Resources and Environment's process participants understand our interest.

Interests result by examining what our needs, desires, concerns, fears and hopes are about land use allocations on this Island and by participating at this Table.

We believe we need to be involved in this negotiation although most of us have been frustrated with past "processes" when resulting conclusions and recommendations were ignored or challenged. There are examples of ignored community level planning processes all over this Island and Province. We feel that the shift in our society towards general environmental awareness is a welcomed shift and we endorse the changes requested of society in a managed considerate manner that does not quickly drive us to a state of chaos and suffering.

We represent rural resource based community of interests. We represent the need for social and economic stability as a major requirement of any land use consideration. All too often, the focus is on rural resource communities because of their obvious needs but social and economic sustainability concerns us all from resource development to urban expansion.

Many communities of this Province have developed, over many years, an infrastructure financed and nurtured by the economic and social rewards of renewable and non-renewable resource uses - mining, fishing, forestry, agriculture, tourism, and government.

We are the people who have been raised in the communities in the areas where our natural resources are concentrated. We have built those communities and we respect and value the resources very dearly. We work and recreate in these areas. These resources shaped our past and will form our future! The close relationship between our workplace and our recreation place is part of our heritage locally and provincially. Over the past decades, as the majority of our nations population have become removed from direct contact with the resources of the land and water, we have noticed a change of attitude, respect and understanding for humans who physically provide the nation with many of its needs. We all consume and use the products provided by the resource dependent communities but many people don't really understand the work, lifestyle, respect or dedication that workers have put into the products we enjoy.

We are attempting, at this Table, to remind you all of these important needs the providers of these products have and to consider both the people and their needs in our planning.

Cooperation and change are much more palatable when the people directly impacted know they are respected for their labours and whose future is considered significant.
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We need to be here to assure these values (our heritage) are recognized and form part of a consensus solution. We are dedicated to ensuring that our communities remain intact and that the potential to continue our lifestyles in our communities is sustained while we work as providers in our respective natural resources.

We have concerns that our perspective on life in communities will be overlooked by de-humanizing the issues being debated. It has become fashionable these days by various environmental groups and media to discredit or "pigeon hole" any thinking which supports development or continuation of resource use as being "pro-industry". Society must be made aware that the communities of our Province have been allowed to develop and grow due to decisions of government and the needs of society. Needs of the greater population have permitted and encouraged the existence of all communities, whether it be Port McNeill, Victoria or Vancouver. Our natural resources have been controlled and developed through a system of allocations and permits which are supported in the courts of the land. People were invited to move to these remote areas of our natural resources and encouraged to establish rural communities by investing their labour and lives in the work of providing for the majority of users. We, the people of these communities, lived under the laws of the land - the allocations and permits that had been negotiated. These days, the providers are being told that all we are concerned about is promoting the financial interests of the major companies that our past governments have encouraged to our Province to develop our natural resources.

The people of our communities are hard working people who often find it difficult to express their concerns and fears in public forums or media. We are here to attempt to help them express those interests.

We realize that the major investors in this Province have been given contractual assurances, from government that they have a long-time future in development of natural resources. This investment capital has allowed development of all our natural resources - mining, forestry, tourism, fishing, agriculture and ranching. We, the people, who live and work in the areas these large investment companies have developed, are well aware of how we are dependent on those companies. In turn, we also realize these companies have to have continued assurances from government that their investments have a future. Our Sector membership understands the interaction between people in community and the economic reality of life, that major investment dollars is essential in resource industries. The example of this relationship do not only apply to the standard fish plants, lumber or pulp mills, logging operations of all sizes, mines, tour operators, or agricultural companies. For example, the major investment company who develops a lodge, a ski resort, a sport fishing complex or a river rafting adventure business are all expected that the money they invest in a business venture will be returned to them in the future with enough profits to pay employees and develop a higher standard of living. Those employees now become dependent on that tourism investment company to ensure their future in their communities. They are now "pro-industry".
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We are concerned our voice will not be heard over the powerful voices of multi-national interests at this Table including, fisheries, mining, forestry, environmental groups, government, unions or tourism but processes like this one will not succeed without the support and cooperation of the people most affected.

Our Sector believes that the concept of "compensation" implies a predetermined outcome of these negotiations. However, when the topics of compensation for forest companies or the forestry union employees is debated, we never hear about compensation or retraining for the owners or employees of secondary industries that are directly dependent on the primary industry.

We desire an appreciation of the impact on these secondary industries as well as small business owners and their families and employees and their families. We desire consideration for the families of small communities whether they work as company management or employees. They are human beings with family responsibilities and an integral part of community life. Our families are the ones responsible for our Youth.

If anyone at this Table supports compensation please describe it clearly in terms of all those affected. If this Table recommends that there will be no compensation then tell the communities and all others affected the truth - that they are on their own!

It is our desire to have a comprehensive socio-economic impact analysis completed for each affected community, this Vancouver Island region and this Province. If done correctly, the impact study will reveal the cost to workers, families and business'. Our communities will then be able to direct our government on the appropriate road to take to achieve sustainability. This desire results from a fear that the 12% goal is merely a political decision and is not founded on scientific fact. Is the 12% goal achievable on Vancouver Island with our high population and expected growth potential? Are small rural communities expected to take the full impact of the 12% goal?

How can the impacts of the 12% be distributed to all the population of the Island? We do not automatically accept the government's goal of 12% of B.C. be set aside for preservation. Set aside should follow local and regional needs regarding both economic and forest diversity. Protect special places and protect the working forest.

We fear that the social and economic dependence on our natural resources is not being adequately considered with the same weight that perceived environmental concern is being addressed. Most scientific evidence available to us these days is often inconclusive, at best it generates heated debate, yet we hear conclusions and recommendations that are developed from this incomplete data base. We fear government will bow even further to
the emotionalism connected with the environment at the expense of people in rural communities. We become tense at the thought that government will legislate the dismantling of small communities and force more population to join the already environmentally and socially questionable atmosphere of large cities. We fear the emotionalism will continue to attack and dismantle major industries in our Province. We fear that our society's economic future may be placed in jeopardy due to drastic and unfounded environmental pressures.

We fear the solutions that government endorses will be too drastic without enough transition time associated with the careful plan needed to change our present culture to a sustainable society. Although we recognize and support positive solutions to legitimate needs, we can not support reactionary policies that seriously disrupt our economic viability.

We hope to improve the existing infrastructure and diversity of our communities and thereby promote their growth. We promote the concept that the CORE Table solutions and recommendations will involve the concept of progressive growth instead of dwelling in the negative thoughts of retraction and dismantling of existing structure. We hope that our regional solution will incorporate a trend to improving our standard of living not just improving our quality of life. We hope we can generate more jobs from sustainable uses of our resources and that the transition period will be long enough for communities to adjust. If, the dismantling of the economic base of major investors is recommended, we hope that in re-allocating some resources to smaller companies or local companies that communities will be enhanced, not negatively impacted. Although foreign ownership of some of our Canadian assets is a concern to some, to the people in small communities, ownership of the title or permit to use the resource makes little difference as long as the population and community lifestyle is considered and protected. The people of our communities who work in secondary industries fully realize that if the primary industries are critically altered their dependent industries and employment responsibilities are duly effected which in turn effects the other components of community which rely on population or tax base. We hope this social and economic web is not only understood but respected in these CORE Table negotiations.

We hope the Table understands that to say we are "pro-industry", whatever industry that is, implies we are pro-community, pro-environmentally responsible, pro-stability of social values, and pro-economic stability. We hope you understand that we realize that there are changes needed on the road to sustainability but stability of our values must be a key component of the solution.

What could we lose if this process does not succeed?

We do not feel, at this time, that this CORE process can develop a total consensus in all issues we are mandated to address in the short time frame we have been allotted with the
little funds and information to substantiate all the claims at this Table. However, with those restrictions realized, we are at this Table to be a positive voice in the deliberations. We are here to make sure you understand our interests more clearly and to better appreciate your interests. We are here to make sure statements, conclusions, and recommendations are not made without verification or justification. We are not convinced that if this process succeeds the "war in the woods" or the "war in any other natural resource industry" will be over.

Sustainability in our society will only be achieved when all the people become aware of the social and economic impacts that awaits us. If the principles of sustainability are forced on society without a careful planning strategy the transition will be rejected and immense suffering will occur.

Time is the key to change. Our strategy must incorporate enough time to allow the education and acceptance of principles of sustainability to spread through all Sectors of our communities. If recommended as a necessity, the transition of down sizing primary industries to a social and economic society of secondary industries must be given the appropriate planning and time to succeed.

Everyone in this room should look into their own life and examine how you are dependent, as we are, on a natural resource. Eventually, in a changing society, we may all be asked to give up parts of our lifestyle or standard of living, in the name of sustainability. I ask you, "which part are you willing to give up?" Are you willing to give a good job, good friends, and a good community? Do not think only in terms of what you want to take away from other - only then will we find a solution to integrate our interests and our resources.
TOURISM SECTOR
INTEREST STATEMENT

B.C. natural and cultural resources are the core of the tourism industry's product. The prosperity and sustainability of the industry is dependent on maintaining a Supernatural B.C. for the enjoyment of residents and visitors alike. Today's tourists are knowledgeable, environmentally sensitive and culturally aware. They recognize the need for and benefits of sustainable tourism.

INTERESTS INCLUDE

- Ensuring the viability of the tourism industry.
- Providing pleasing landscapes along transportation corridors; for example, roads, trails, rivers, streams, marine waterways and inland lake systems.
- Protecting, maintaining and enhancing our natural resources: clear air, clear water, wildlife habitat, fish and marine life.
- Protecting, maintaining and enhancing significant historical and cultural sites.
- Assuring availability of areas relatively close to urban areas for soft adventure tourism activities such as golfing, light hiking, bicycling, cross country skiing, fishing, horseback riding, wildlife viewing and bird watching.
- Developing new tourism products which are compatible with a multi-use land base to meet changing demographic and social trends.
- Contributing to the economic diversification, long-term stability, recreation opportunities, and quality of life of communities through tourism and tourism related employment.
- Liaising with First Nations in the development of tourism product initiatives.
- Cooperating with local communities in the development of tourism product initiatives.
- Developing a tourism land use designation/tenure system to create and protect areas of high tourism use and high tourism capability.
- Ensuring tourism infrastructure interests are accounted for in long term, economic development and land use planning.
- Ensuring access to areas around Strathcona Park.
PROVING visual landscapes in high tourism use areas and high tourism capabilities.

- Having explicit tourism industry representation in all land use decisions at the regional, sub-regional and local level.
- Co-existing with other industries and contributing to the economic diversification of communities.

NEEDS

- Accurate data about the value and socio-economic impact of tourism.
- Identification of special cultural heritage features.
- Identification of special recreation features.
- Identification of the environmental and social carrying capacity of the land to maintain quality of the environment and the tourism experience and assure long-term prosperity and sustainability.
- Public policies which assure effective management of natural and cultural resources upon which tourism depends.
- Environmental guidelines (such as those developed by the World Travel and Tourism Council) to assure tourism industry growth is compatible with a healthy safe and agreeable environment.
- Public policies and regulations which create conditions favourable to private Sector investment in the tourism industry.
- Community based, tourism education and training to increase the supply of personnel and enhance their professionalism to support community economic diversification.
- Decisions made in consultation with the tourism industry and community and with regard to the economic impact on individual operators and the industry as a whole.
- For the tourism industry, communities and other industries to provide opportunities for visitors to experience and be educated about B.C.'s diverse economy.
The physical environment is at centre stage in tourism development. Shifts in demand from one destination to another are partly due to environmental concerns. If B.C. is perceived to be environmentally insensitive, our competitiveness in the world market place will suffer.

- Unplanned urban growth that creates visual and physical pollution and negatively impacts the well-being of the community makes it difficult to attract visitors.

HOPES

- That investment in the tourism industry will be increased over time.
- That tourism will continue to contribute to the economic diversification prosperity and sustainability of communities as it co-exists with multiple land use interests.

SUSTAINABILITY

By sustainable we mean that our natural and cultural resources are maintained and enhanced in sufficient quality and quantity to continue to bring visitors in to use our products and services. We need to use our land and resources in ways that are environmentally, economically and socially viable and acceptable to assure the availability of these resources in perpetuity.
GROUP REPRESENTING YOUTH FOR FUTURE INTERESTS NOW (GRYFIN) did not get involved in the CORE process because of an expertise in planning or consensus decision making. We got involved because we see the place that past decisions have brought us to, and we fear for the future. This is not an isolated fear, but it is a common feeling amongst youth across Vancouver Island. As those who will have to live with the outcomes of the decisions being made today, we feel that youth need to take a leadership role in asserting their fears, needs, and hopes: creating a livable future now.

I'm afraid of the future. I don't know what my life will be like in twenty years, and I don't know what kinds of life my children will have. I'm afraid to have children.

Sometimes I think about what it would have been like to live 100 years ago when the future was something to look forward to and to plan for. Now, everything seems so uncertain. I don't know if I'll have a job that I'll want to do. I don't know if I'll be able to go out in the sun. I don't know if there'll be enough food and water for everybody, even now so many people are dying around the world from starvation and disease. I don't know if I'll be able to experience an ancient forest or hike through a wilderness area. I'm not sure what will happen to my community; a lot of young people are moving away and those who stay often end up working at jobs they don't like.

I'd like to buy some land one day and build a house, but it doesn't look like I'll ever be able to afford that. It seems like the things that my parents took for granted are more and more out of reach.

I worry about all of the things that we're losing every day. All the species that are disappearing that might hold the cure for cancer or for AIDS. And not just in South America, but in our own back yard. It feel sad for all of those other species too, because they have the right to live and to share the planet with us. I'm also afraid about the ozone layer which is disappearing more every year. We don't know what it will be like in twenty years or fifty years. We don't know what the effects are going to be on our crops, on our forests, and on our health. All we know is that it won't be good. I'm afraid that it might be worse than we can even imagine. The same with global warming. Maybe this Island will be a desert in 100 years. Where will our children live then?

I'm afraid about the globalization of the world economy. I'm afraid that it will lead to the loss of control at the national, community, and individual levels. It's already so hard to participate in decision-making processes, and I'm afraid that this will become even more difficult as power is increasingly centralized and made less accountable to the majority of people.

Sometimes I'm afraid for my own safety. With more and more people living in big cities and with lots of people out of work and unhappy with their lives, society seems to get more violent and more uncaring. How many more people can this Island and this Earth support?
I know people get more frustrated and more violent when they feel helpless and unsure about the future. I know a lot of families where there is abuse and violence, and this seems to be getting worse and worse. I'm especially afraid for my native friends, because their future seems even more bleak. I wonder what it was like for them 500 years ago.

I fear a lot of things when I really think about it, and so do most of my friends. What's even worse is that we don't really know what to do about our fears. We don't seem to have a lot of political power in our society, and we're afraid that we won't be listened to or that we won't be understood. That can make people feel helpless, and when you're afraid for your life and for your family and for everything that is important to you, that's an awful feeling.

I don't think that we're asking too much. The things that we need to survive and to lead the kinds of lives that we want aren't unreasonable. All people, past, present, and future, need clear air, water and food. I don't think that anyone would want to deprive another creature of these basic needs, but it is happening all over the world. More and more people in our own communities are suffering too. Why? What can we do to ensure these basic needs?

We need to be fair. Children that are being born today deserve the same opportunities that our parents and grandparents enjoyed. They also deserve the freedom to make choices about the kind of society that they want to build. I don't think that it's fair to think about children today or the next generation of children either. What about in 500 years or 1000 years? That's not such a long time in human history. How can we be fair to the people of that age? How can we be sure that they also have clear air, water, and food and the ability to enjoy their families, their communities, and their lives? Just because we'll be dead doesn't mean that their lives aren't important.

We need to find meaningful work, too. People need to have pride and satisfaction in what they do otherwise they get frustrated and angry. I want to have some choices about my future; whether I want to work outdoors or in an office, in a large city or in a rural area. The economy needs to be strong and diverse so it can support the variety of interests that we have. We also need a sustainable economy, of course. I don't think that we can separate the economy from the environment or from community stability. We need a holistic approach to planning and decision making that accounts for this interconnectedness and for the long-term needs of youth and future generations.

We also need some kind of provincial and national accounting system that takes into account our depletion of environmental capital. We need a system that reflects the true costs of economic activity and charts our impacts on future generations. We need policy and legislation to transform the rhetoric of sustainability into effective action.
We're happy that we're now being listened to in planning decisions, and we would like to expand this role to include more young people from diverse backgrounds having input into all levels of decision making. We need to feel valued and understood. One third of our population has no political voice. We want to change this by empowering young people everywhere to feel confident to speak out against injustice and to get involved in decision making processes. We need control over our lives and our futures.

As well as being listened to, we need the power to reconsider some of the outdated legislation that has contributed to our present state of economic and environmental decline. We need the ability to decide the future of important issues like tenure reform and compensation for the reallocation of Crown land - to ignore these issues is to decide to accept the status quo.

Part of having choice and control, means the need for communities. Communities form the hub for control over jobs, education, social services, and the environment. Communities form a sense of place and belonging, qualities that are threatened by uncontrolled development and growth. We want all members of our communities to feel valued and fulfilled so that social harmony is possible.

We also need high quality health, education, and daycare services. Bringing up healthy children now is a valuable part of healthy communities for the future. We need to put an end to the abuse and neglect of children.

Most of all, we need action now. The status quo has brought us conflict, inequity, and mistrust. It is up to each and every one of us to act as agents of change to bring about the kind of world we want.
Table Composition
Table Recommendations and Considerations

The participants in the Vancouver Island negotiation process hoped to develop a comprehensive land use plan and strategy for Vancouver Island that would satisfy the interests of all sectors.

The Table worked towards its goal by building agreements on a variety of issues, with the clear understanding that all such agreements were provisional until an entire land use plan and strategy “package” was agreed upon. Since the process ended without completing that task, this report contains the interim and provisional recommendations agreed upon by the Table, rather than the comprehensive land use plan and strategy which the Table set out to achieve.

The following recommendations meet some of the interests expressed at the table and should be seen as a constructive step towards the goal of consensus on a comprehensive land use plan and strategy for Vancouver Island. However, to reach this goal, the spectrum of interests not addressed in this report must also be accommodated. Towards this end, the Table refers the Commissioner to the Sector Interest Statements in Appendix 3.

Where the Table was unable to reach consensus on a given issue, but felt it important to inform the Commissioner about the issue, the reasons for disagreement are outlined.

Land Use

General

The Table’s Land Designation Committee prepared a draft Land Designation System (LDS) framework comprising five broad categories of land use. The Table agreed in principle that the five category LDS should be applied on Vancouver Island. There was not agreement, however, that all five of the LDS categories should be applied at the regional planning level, and there was not agreement upon which classes of lands the designations should be applied.

Efforts at application of the LDS, including refinements and variations on its interpretation, are found in the several land use scenarios/alternatives that were prepared by the Technical Working Group and Table sectors.

The LDS framework and points of discussion on its application, as prepared by the Land Designation Committee, are contained in the following sections. This material does not reflect a Table consensus, given that it was prepared by the Land Designation Committee (LDC) as an interim product, pending ratification and consensus application by the Table, which did not occur.
Designation Principles And Objectives

Principles:
1. The LDS will: Be consistent with the Land Use Charter.
2. The LDS will: Realize and reflect the Table's 2020 Vision Statement for Vancouver Island.
3. The LDS will: Be without prejudice to First Nations treaty negotiations and rights.

Objectives:
The LDS should:
- Be flexible and adaptable
- Accommodate sectoral interests
- Be able to link to government policies and resource management requirements
- Include assurances that the intent of land designations will be realized
- Be simple to understand and use
- Integrate uses when possible and appropriate
- Provide direction to sub-regional and local planning processes

Designation System

The designation system is comprised of five broad categories that span the 'spectrum of land use', ranging from least modification to the landscape (protected area designation) to most modification to the landscape (settlement). Within any of the five categories (but particularly the Low Intensity Use and High Intensity Use categories) the regional land designation system is capable of identifying a 'sub-category' to reflect a particular management priority or emphasis for a given area.
Each of the five land use designation categories is described below in terms of:

**Intent/Purpose:** An expression of the basic reason for the designation.

**Activities:** An indication of some of the key activities/uses that would be considered compatible with the intent/purpose of the designation. (Note that the lists of activities provided in each designation are examples and are not complete; they require further consideration and wording refinement).

**Guidelines/Assurances:** A mixture of legislation, policies, processes or resource management guidelines that may be essential and require inclusion or consideration in application and implementation of the land designation system.

**Category 1: Protected Area**

**Intent/Purpose:**
To designate areas for the protection of viable representative examples of natural diversity; and protect the special natural, cultural heritage and recreational features of the province (see PAS).

**Sample Activities:**
- Conservation - natural systems/ecological functions.
- Recreation (diverse opportunities).
- Cultural/Heritage.
- No extractive uses (as per PAS).

**Guidelines/Assurances:**
- PAS policy proposal is a five sub-class break-down, determined through more detailed planning processes. The regional process might advise on management class, where possible.
- Need for open, public participation in planning/management prescriptions.
- Need for monitoring and enforcement.

**Category 2: Low Intensity Use**

**Intent/Purpose:**
To designate areas that give priority for maintenance of regionally significant recreational and/or natural qualities and functions, while allowing compatible human uses.
Sample Activities:

- Conservation corridors
- Community watersheds
- Model/experimental forests
- Critical wildlife habitat
- Recreation uses
- Scenic travel corridors/viewscapes
- Wildcraft
- Compatible resource extraction and management (including forestry and timber production)
- Recreation viewscapes
- Spiritual use
- Sustenance uses

Guidelines/Assurances:

- Open public processes in sub-regional/local planning.
- Parity in funding across agencies.
- Where appropriate, there is potential for timber harvesting to occur.
- Non-consumptive uses/values will not be compromised by resource extraction uses or developments.
- This LUD will be applied to lands that are regionally significant or sensitive.
- This LUD will contribute to the maintenance of land use options for future generations.
- Application of this LUD will specify (identify) the significant recreational, and/or natural qualities and functions that are to be maintained.

Category 3: Integrated Use

Intent/Purpose:
To designate areas for integrated management where a wide range of compatible uses is permitted.

Sample Activities:

- Forestry and timber production
- Mining/energy
- Fish/Wildlife conservation
- Community watersheds
- Recreation
Tourism
Hunting
Sustenance
Trapping
Wildcraft
Model/Experimental Forests
Agriculture/Aquaculture

Guidelines/Assurances:
- Approved coast planning, fish-forestry, biodiversity and other guidelines and requirements would apply and be enforced.
- These areas should be the priority for Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs), as determined by government.
- This LUD seeks the true integration and harmonization of all non-settlement values - not just some.
- Cumulative impacts won't degrade resource values.
- Recognize the wide mix of interests, values, and capabilities on these lands and that it is impractical to 'sort-out' our how to best integrate these at regional scale - have to defer this to sub-regional/local process.

Category 4: High Intensity Use

Intent/Purpose:
To designate areas that give priority for specific resource development uses and activities.

Sample Activities:
- Timber production
- Mining/energy
- Tourism
- Commercial recreation - resource based
- Resource based tourism facilities
- Agriculture
- Aquaculture
- Wildcraft
- Model/Experimental Forests
Guidelines/Assurances:
- Appropriate Provincial guidelines need to be developed for this LUD.
- Good stewardship should be applied (not a regulation-free zone).
- Productive forest lands should not be converted to other uses.
- Regional plan should indicate why LUD is being established.

Category 5: Settlement

Intent/Purpose:
To recognize areas of human settlement uses and infrastructure, including commercial and industrial uses.

Sample Activities:
- Determined by local government

Guidelines/Assurances:
- This LUD won't pre-empt local government jurisdiction over settlement lands.
- Policy recommendations may be warranted that take into consideration issues of future growth, growth potential, and possibility that we need a growth management strategy/plan for Vancouver Island.
- Policy recommendations may be warranted to support forestry management on rural settlement areas.
- Regional plan map should reflect private settled lands (as generally located from satellite information - not legal survey boundaries).
- Regional plan should not dictate specific land use activities - local government planning processes should prescribe specific land use authorizations.

Application and Implementation Considerations

To complement the policy recommendations identified in other sections of this report, the following considerations are suggested in regard to subsequent work for application and implementation of the previously described land designation system.
1. Regional / Sub-Regional Relationships

The Vancouver Island regional plan will designate the land base into broad categories and, for each category, identify the activities that are compatible with the intent of the category. At the regional planning scale, however, it is not possible to precisely identify all site-specific uses and activities. Finer grain planning at the sub-regional and local levels is required to perform the site-specific application of the regional designations. This might involve some refinement of the boundaries of regional designations or further subdivision of regional designations.

Sub-regional and local plans are to be guided by the regional designations, and are not intended to revamp regional designations, but rather to specify different permitted activities within the designation and to provide more detailed management prescriptions. Re-categorization of land at the sub-regional or local levels must only be done through an approved process which acknowledges the regional plan. Therefore, to provide the best possible guidance to sub-regional / local plans and to minimize the potential for inconsistency with the regional perspective, the regional plan should be as clear as possible in setting-out the compatible and conditional uses within the regional designations.

2. Mechanism for Review, Amendment, Re-designation

It is acknowledged that the regional plan must be responsive to changing circumstances or priorities, or the availability of new information, and that this can be best accommodated through:

a) a specified process for formal plan review and amendment that is scheduled on a periodic basis (e.g. five years). This might involve reconvening the Table, or some other structure that is recommended by the Table.

b) a specified process that responds to proposals to re-designate (‘re-zone’) land or approve uses/activities for a given area. This might result from a particular land use proposal; or from some new information that becomes available through a local process or some other source. Structures to meet this requirement might involve CORE, a Table or government committee, a local mechanism, or some combination of these options in which all significantly affected interests are represented.

3. Adjacency Issues and Buffering

In developing and applying the land use designation system the goal should be compatible adjacent land uses that integrate socio-economic and conservation objectives in an overall land use pattern.

Adjacency issues could be dealt with in a number of ways, including: the use of the low intensity use designation (Category 2) as buffer around or corridors among protected area reserves; the application of the ‘transitional zoning’ approach which requires a gradation of categories according to intensity of use and impact; statements in each category description that require special restrictions or possible disallowance for permitted uses which are on the fringe of a designation; or a blanket statement about caution or restrictions on any use within a certain distance of a category boundary.
4. Categories and Sub-Categories

Regional planning must provide sufficient clarity and direction so that sub-regional / local processes can efficiently interpret the intent of regional land use designations. This means that although five broad regional land use categories sufficiently cover the complete ‘spectrum of land use’ there is a need for regional designation (particularly in categories 2 and 4) to indicate management priority/emphasis wherever possible. Five broad categories should be identified on the regional land use map, and shown with a colour, shade and/or alphabetical symbol. The location of intended or existing ‘priority’ use or management emphasis within any category would be shown on the map and denoted through an alphabetical subscript (e.g. High Intensity Use - Agriculture: could be shown as IA).

There could be a relatively large number of sub-categories but only five main designations. This preliminary land designation system will evolve and be fine-tuned through experimentation with it in an actual land allocation scenario development exercise. It may be premature to try to develop detailed category descriptions without the benefit of a scenario map. Specific uses and management prescriptions should be developed in more detail through Table negotiations.

5. ‘Wildlands’ and Values

It is recognized that there is a large amount of land on Vancouver Island that may be “economically idle” but “ecologically active”. Due to scale limitations it is probably more appropriate to locate these areas at sub-regional/local levels and assign priority to reflect ‘wildland’ character.

6. Transportation/Access

Human access can have a potentially significant impact on communities and resources. Land use patterns are influenced, as may be the basic sustainability of regional and local economies. Although detailed consideration of these issues is potentially difficult within a broad scale regional land allocation plan, it is recognized that overall regional access/transportation policy recommendations are needed for Vancouver Island.

7. Sustainability Monitoring

Sustainability involves the integration of economic, environmental and social systems. Indicators of sustainability need to be developed and programs implemented to monitor sustainability against the indicators, to identify cumulative effects. Sustainability monitoring results will provide essential information for land use plan review and amendment processes.
Economic Transition

A transition and mitigation strategy for those affected by land use decisions is a key element in achieving a balance of economic, environmental and social requirements.

Economic Transition Strategy

The Table was unable to reach consensus on an economic transition strategy. An economic transition strategy proposal was developed by the Table, but upon review by sector steering committees, the proposal proved unacceptable to some sectors. On the one hand, for some sectors, there was difficulty in committing to a specific formula for calculating the funds required per displaced worker, which was sought in order to provide sufficient security for potentially displaced workers. On the other hand, there was insufficient definition from the Table of the magnitude of job loss, so that there was difficulty in determining the precise scope of a funding commitment.

In addition, some sectors felt that a transition strategy should be broader in scope supporting a wider range of workers and promoting economic diversity. Others were concerned about the potential cost and precedent setting nature of the initiative.

For the benefit of the Commissioner, the proposal as written on November 10, 1993 for Steering Committee consideration is reproduced here, however, it should not be construed as a consensus recommendation. The Table agreed to submit the following text to their Steering Committees for their endorsement:

We recommend to government that all land use allocation decisions from this Table that reduce or alter the scale or scope of industry must be supported by a transition strategy that includes:

1. a specific commitment that details the amounts of government funding and other secured sources of revenue that are available to support transition, with the amounts based on the best available information as to the cost of transition per employee affected, not to be less than the total annual average wage and benefits of the affected employee group, sufficient to provide effective transition for each employee.

2. a specific range of transition initiatives, options and programs that will create new opportunities within industry for every affected employee or allow them to voluntarily leave the industry without undue hardship.

3. an agency specifically mandated to finance and implement the transition strategy. The agency should operate at arm’s length from government and should include representatives of government, industry, labour and the community.

This initiative should be funded in a way which is affordable and equitable.
Any land use recommendation contemplated by the Commission on Resources and Environment, which will adversely affect community stability, must be contingent upon the implementation of an effective community based transition process.

The Table recommends that, as part of a transition strategy required to mitigate the impacts of land use allocation decisions from this Table, the Forest Act be amended to include rights to compensation to those parties who have defined contractual rights.

Strengthening Existing Economies and Resources

Recommendations:

To build on the strengths of our existing economies and resource endowment the following should be carried out.

There is a need to:

1. Create an awareness of the opportunities of diverse industry; of increased investment; and, of the reliability of a capable educated workforce.

2. Undertake programs of intensive silviculture and forest rehabilitation. Forest ecosystems should be managed to maintain a broad range of forest values, as well as to increase yields and provide increased employment that is economically and socially justifiable to all sectors concerned. This may be achieved through:

   - Prompt reforestation with appropriate and improved nursery stock or satisfactory natural regeneration;
   - Thinning and pruning;
   - Fertilization, where these techniques can be shown to be consistent with other ecological or environmental values;
   - Guidelines for the rehabilitation of forestry roads, backspur trails, landings and other phases of forest operations after harvest;
   - Management of production of a diverse range of forest products in addition to timber; and
   - Maintenance of quality habitat for fish and wildlife resources.

3. Initiate enhanced stewardship and intensive silviculture.

4. Consult industry workers and communities before any decisions or impacts are made on employment or land base. A strategy must be provided for workers, and notice prior to transition must be as long as possible.
Diversification

Recommendations:

The following actions should be undertaken to promote economic diversification on Vancouver Island.

1. Government feasibility studies to examine tourism opportunities for such activities as boating, camping, canoeing, hiking, kayaking, skiing, and whale watching.

2. To attract, develop and sustain a tourism workforce capable of offering internationally competitive standards of service to visitors traveling to and within British Columbia.

Goals: To empower people and organizations to realize the full potential of a world-class tourism workforce in British Columbia, seven goals suggest what needs to be achieved:

a) To improve public attitudes about the economic benefits and employment potential of the tourism industry in British Columbia.

b) To improve employment matching between employers searching for qualified employees, and individuals seeking opportunities for entry into the tourism workforce.

c) To enhance the scope, accessibility, quality and occupational relevance of tourism-related training and education programs and workplace learning resources in all regions in British Columbia.

d) To enhance informed decision-making by improving access to career planning, educational, human resource and labour force information.

e) To enhance communication, cooperation and coordination between and among industry stakeholders and providers of education, training and support services in all regions of British Columbia.

f) To support the ongoing professional development and recognition of working tourism professionals and of those who provide tourism-related counseling, education, training, human resource and community development services.

g) To encourage and share ongoing research into issues affecting the future of tourism and tourism human resource development in British Columbia.

3. Government should encourage further diversification of the Island's agricultural industries and, subject to environmental review, aquaculture industries to grow additional crops and raise additional livestock and fish.

4. Government encouragement of further local processing for agriculture, aquaculture and fishing.
5. Government consider providing access to a fibre optic cable system on the Island.


8. Further development of training programs for workers for targeted businesses and industries.


10. Government facilitate the development of small scale tourism facilities in areas adjacent to protected areas.

11. Government should maintain adequate support for communities to act on diversification programs.

A Sustainable Society

According to the Bruntland Commission "...many of us live beyond the world's ecological means, for instance in our patterns of energy use".

Developing a sustainable economy requires limiting our consumption of material goods to "standards that are within the bounds of the ecologically possible and to which all can reasonably aspire".

The need to develop a "sustainable society" has already been recognized by the Table in its Vision Statement, which seeks a balance between standard of living and quality of life. We all recognize that a certain level of material consumption is essential to human well-being. We also acknowledge the danger of putting too much emphasis on material consumption, at the expense of the many other elements of "quality of life".

Recommendations:

1. Social and economic policies should strive to ensure that every person in our society can attain a basic level of material consumption necessary for health and well-being.

2. Keeping in mind the pluralistic nature of society, the government should consider social and economic policies which discourage excessive material consumption, for instance through taxation policies and public awareness campaigns and education.
Economic Self-sufficiency

Complete self-sufficiency is not a realistic goal in the modern world, and perhaps it is not desirable. Our Vision Statement recognizes that our ability to trade and compete in various markets affects the economic and social strength of our society. However, a strong measure of self-sufficiency is an essential component of a secure, sustainable and robust economy.

Self-sufficiency is valuable at every level of the economy. For example, at the level of the individual or household, a self-sufficient lifestyle can be personally enriching by providing a wide variety of experience and a sense of accomplishment.

For a region, or the province as a whole, a greater degree of self-sufficiency provides a buffer against the harmful effects of rapid changes in the larger scale economy.

Recommendations:

Individual or Domestic Self-Sufficiency

1. Provincial land use policies should be designed to maintain opportunities for self-sufficient lifestyles.

2. Land use policies should preserve opportunities for public access to resources for self-sufficient lifestyles (e.g. access to forests for cutting firewood and building materials, access to wild stocks of shellfish and fin-fish).

3. A review of B.C.'s forest tenure system should study the opportunities and potential benefits of making small Crown land tenures available for partly self-sufficient lifestyles (e.g., a sort of woodlot/homestead tenure).

4. Employment policies should not penalize workers who choose seasonal or part-time employment.

Regional, Provincial and National Self-Sufficiency

1. Provincial land use policies should encourage a wide diversity of productive uses of land.

2. A province-wide public awareness campaign should be initiated to inform the public of the benefits of trading locally or within the province or country, as a complement to importing products.

3. Economic development programs should give at least equal emphasis to production of a wide range of goods for domestic use, as to production for export markets.
Policy

The scope of the Table’s mandate includes providing advice respecting land use and resource management policies. The following section describes numerous policy objectives that, when acted upon in conjunction with other Table recommendations, will contribute greatly to realization of the Land Use Charter and the Table’s 2020 Vision for Vancouver Island.

General

The following broad recommendations should be kept in mind in the development of the specific policies recommended elsewhere in the Plan.

Recommendations:

1. The Table recommends that policy should be governed by the Land Use Charter, the 2020 Vision Statement for Vancouver Island, and the principles of shared decision-making.

2. Policies should describe performance criteria which, if not met, would result in penalties. Additionally, policies should incorporate incentives for performance which surpasses these criteria.

3. Land Use Policies should incorporate the principle of performance-based management.

4. This Table endorses the principles of, and criteria for sustainability, as defined in the following B.C. Round Table on the Environment and Economy Reports:
   - Towards Sustainability: Learning for Change
   - An Economic Framework for Sustainability
   - Strategic Directions for Community Sustainability
   - Sustainability: From Ideas to Action
   - Towards a Strategy for Sustainability

5. Resource utilization should have the objective of promoting regional and community, social and economic stability, taking into account the conservation of wildlife habitat and populations.

6. Land use planning that changes how a resource is used or allocated should contain an analysis of the social, economic and biophysical effects of that change, with emphasis on the effects on communities dependent on the resource.

7. Land use planning should anticipate future depletion or reallocation of a resource on which a community depends, and should include positive measures to set aside funds for community transition while the resource is generating wealth.
8. Community transition funds should be treated as funds available for community investment, rather than for compensation or mitigation. The community affected should participate directly in the allocation of such funds.

9. The public trust should be recognized to underlie all of our Crown held resources (e.g., forest resources).

Intergenerational Equity

Intergenerational Equity has been accepted by the Vancouver Island Table as a fundamental principle which needs to be applied to all land-use decisions. The concept recognizes our responsibility to future generations unable to speak for their own interests. The present generation, in meeting our needs, must not restrict the ability of future generations to meet their needs. Land-use decisions made now need to also preserve options for future generations such that they are able to meet their needs according to their own values and interests. The following recommendations are made by the Table in recognition of our over-arching commitment to intergenerational equity:

Recommendation:

1. Ecological sustainability and the maintenance of biodiversity are fundamental commitments underlying land use and resource decisions.

2. An independent agency such as the Office of the Ombudsman should acquire the responsibility of ensuring the attainment of the goals of intergenerational equity.

3. The transition to ecologically sustainable use of renewable resources needs to be supported by a fair and timely economic and social transition strategy and all such strategies must be directed toward the transition to sustainability.

4. To ensure intergenerational equity the precautionary principle needs to be applied to land and resource use where scientific uncertainty exists as to the sustainability of such uses.

5. Future generations should not be saddled with an unfair debt.

Forestry

Forestry has long been one of the foundations of the Island's economy. We believe with proper planning and sensitivity to the Island's social, environmental and economic needs, it is possible to have a healthy, sustainable forest industry and enjoy all the benefits that flow from it.
Implementation of a land use strategy on Vancouver Island while meeting the needs of the forest industry and forest-dependent communities and workers and all other interests has presented a major challenge to the Table. This challenge has been compounded by the other changes occurring in the forest and the forest industry.

The Table recognizes that the Vancouver Island land use strategy must meet the Provincial policy goals expressed in the Land Use Charter and the Protected Areas Strategy, and accommodate all interests.

Obviously, the larger the area of working forest, the more options exist to meet the interests of the forest industry and those who depend on it. The difficulty is in reaching agreement on the balance amongst the competing interests.

Recommendation:
The following policy goals should form the basis for the development of a forest strategy.

Goals:
1. To integrate and accommodate all interests in forest land in a fair manner.
2. To protect the environment and to maintain healthy forest ecosystems.
3. To protect the forest resource base.
4. To practice environmentally sound and sustainable forestry based on ecologically sustainable harvest rates.
5. To build a stable, viable, and profitable forest industry.
6. To assure a high quality of life for forest workers and their communities.
7. To maintain or increase forest employment opportunities for the residents of Vancouver Island and B.C.
8. To involve forest workers, the forest industry, communities, and other interests in managing Vancouver Island's forests.
9. To invest in the future of forestry on Vancouver Island, rather than simply providing compensation or mitigation.

Recommendation:
Development of a forest strategy should reflect the following:
1. There should be an over-arching commitment to, wherever possible, increased employment in the Forest Sector.
2. Provincial policy on export of unprocessed or semi-processed forest products (e.g. policies on export of raw logs, cants, and chips) should be designed to complement and support this strategy.

3. The Province should lobby vigorously for international trade policies that support this strategy.

4. Forest workers, companies and communities should be involved in this strategy in ways that enhance local input and control and make the greatest use of the initiative of local people.

5. Silviculture should be treated as a fully integrated part of this strategy, providing an on-going employment option for local forest workers.

6. The very long-term nature of the investment called for in this strategy should be accepted. There will likely be a period of time before the investment matures in which forestry will require rather direct support in order to make an effective transition.

7. In order to increase efficiency, all forest practices policies should be consolidated into a single comprehensive non-contradictory code.

8. There should be a review of the tenure allocation system for all natural resources to ensure that the systems are providing the desired mix of social benefits.

Land Use Designation

Recommendation:

Land use designation that will contribute positively to a forest strategy should reflect the following:

1. The Protected Areas Strategy, Land Use Charter policy goals, conservation and other interests through the application of a system of protected areas and management objectives.

2. The interest of the forest industry through a secure, productive working forest in a designated Forest Land Reserve\(^1\), managed to maximize society's benefits from forestry.

   a) A legislated Forest Land Reserve should be established to cover most of the Island's forest land in order to secure and define the Island's forest land base, recognizing the wide variety of values ranging from different kinds of timber harvesting to recreation and tourism. The Forest Land Reserve (FLR) should comprise three levels of intensity of use — high intensity, integrated use and low intensity. It would take into account the need to preserve economic, social and environmental values on a sustainable basis.

---

\(^1\) There is no consensus on including private land in the Forest Land Reserve.
b) The intent of the FLR is to provide a stable forest land base. Land would not be removed unless it could be demonstrated that there would be a significantly greater benefit to society. It would be maintained in much the same manner as the Agricultural Land Reserve, and would therefore require the government to draft enabling legislation in support of establishing the FLR and the related implementation responsibilities.

c) The Forest Practices Code should apply to all three of the middle land use designations (low intensity use, integrated use, and high intensity use).

d) It is recognized that there will be different management intensities in the three designations and that this is consistent with the concept that the requirements within the code will be applied at different intensities in the designations.

e) It is also recognized that small protected areas will be withdrawn from the Forest Land Reserve to complete the protected areas system.

f) The issue of the application of the Forest Land Reserve to private forest lands is dealt with below under “Private Forest Lands”.

3. Policies to sustain and enhance the forest industry and quality of life for forest workers and their communities through investment in the future of Vancouver Island's forests by the people of British Columbia.

Investment in the Future of the Forests

Recommendations:

1. At the heart of the forest strategy is the need for the people of British Columbia to invest in the future of Vancouver Island's forests. The guiding principles should be accountability at the local level, sensitivity to local needs and fairness.

2. The general intent of the investment is to build and maintain a sustainable, ecologically sound forest resource base and to increase the socio-economic benefit of the working forest. This may be accomplished by:

   a) Increasing the yield per hectare of working forests.
   b) Increasing the quality of the timber grown.
   c) Increasing the value of the finished products.
   d) Increasing the diversity of products and opportunities, both timber and non-timber, produced.
   e) Finding new markets.
   f) Developing the productive and creative potential of people in forestry.
g) Conducting research in sustainable forestry methods.

h) Preparing for and facilitating the transition to second growth timber.

3. The investment should move the forest industry to a greater emphasis on specialty marketing based on quality products. Products should be both "value-added" and "knowledge-added".

4. Specific kinds of initiatives that should be targeted for investment are:

**Sustainable Harvesting Methods**

Further development and implementation of environmentally sound and economically viable harvesting systems that are appropriate for site-specific conditions is required.

**Intensive Silviculture And Forest Rehabilitation**

Silviculture activities should be compatible with maintaining the long term diversity and productivity of forest ecosystems. These activities may include the following:

a) Prompt and effective reforestation.

b) Programs to enhance or assist natural regeneration.

c) Development of improved nursery stock.

d) Thinning and pruning.

e) Fertilization (where consistent with environmental considerations).

f) Rehabilitation of forestry roads, trails, landings and other areas after harvest.

g) Management for a diverse range of forest products in addition to timber.

h) Maintenance and rehabilitation of fish and wildlife habitat.

i) Prudent investment in silviculture.

**Advanced Utilization**

Advanced utilization initiatives should be aimed at encouragement of:

a) Value-added and remanufacturing facilities.

b) Keeping value-added manufacturing in the region.

c) Product diversification.

d) Making use of wood waste and waste wood, both in small-scale or innovative manufacturing and as an energy source.

e) Higher utilization standards.
Research And Development

Research and Development efforts should be linked to:

a) Initiatives to target market countries or regions.
b) Development of strategies to find markets for newly developed value-added and remanufactured products.
c) Expanded research into forest ecology, sustainable harvesting methods and technology. Silviculture and sustainable forest management.
d) Development of more sophisticated inventories and evaluative tools.
e) Product development to take advantage of, or create market opportunities.

Training, Skills Development And Public Education

The following initiatives should be pursued in this area:

a) Skills and education upgrading.
b) Retraining, education and counseling to prepare workers in forest-based communities to take advantage of, and participate in creating new opportunities in the forest industry.
c) Programs to educate the public about forests and the forest industry.
d) Programs within the school system to educate the students about the forest and forest industry.

Private Forest Land

Private forest land comprises three kinds of land:

1. Unmanaged forest land.

2. Managed Forest - Forest managed under an agreement with the provincial government, administered by the B.C. Assessment Authority.

3. Private land within Tree Farm Licenses - Land which has been incorporated into a TFL, and is managed to the same standard as Crown land.

The theme common to these three classes is that the land is forest land.

Since most private forest land is both reasonably close to major Vancouver Island population centres and a substantial proportion (something around 20%) of the forest land on the Island, the resource values it contains have a major effect on the public interest. The most significant of those values are:

1. Community watersheds: A large and increasing number of Vancouver Island residents depend on water from private forest land.

2. Forest resources: Private forest lands have a significant effect on forest employment on Vancouver Island. Loss of productive forest land could cause hardship.
3. Conservation of wildlife and fish habitat.

4. Recreation and tourism opportunities and viewscape: Between Victoria and Campbell River, private forest land contributes to the Island's scenery and its most accessible outdoor recreation opportunities.

5. Pollution sink capabilities: Forests are being called upon more to absorb air pollution from urban development.

Recommendations:

1. Resource values (e.g. community watersheds, conservation, recreation, forestry, etc.) on private land that affect the public interest must be recognized.

2. Where the public interest requires that a value on private land be managed to the detriment of the owner's rights, timely and fair compensation must be negotiated.

3. The Occupier's Liability Act should be amended so that the owner of private forest land, particularly Managed Forest land where public access is required, is not liable to those permitted, but not invited, on the land.

4. The government should encourage owners of private forest land to maintain the land as working forest, and to practice sustainable forestry.

Private Land

Recommendations:

1. The general approach to taxation of standing trees on private land that does not qualify for managed forest land status, should be the same as on managed forest land.

Mining

The following recommendations are intended to complement a mineral strategy for British Columbia by accommodating the Mining sector's needs for an extensive exploration land base on Vancouver Island.

Recommendations:

1. Prospecting, staking of mineral claims, exploration and development of the claims be permitted on all of the land base (except protected areas), subject to strict environmental regulation and applicable legislation.
2. A multi-agency committee be charged with reviewing proponent-developed, staged reports which detail relevant technical information, compliance with public input requirements, and how potential negative impacts would be addressed.

3. If the proponent is unable to adequately address legitimate concerns of potential negative impacts on other important resource values, the project must be held-up until technology or economics changes sufficiently to allow the concerns to be addressed. This would not be a case of expropriation requiring compensation.

4. If the proponent is able to meet the legitimate concerns of other impacted values but for reasons beyond the proponents' control is prevented from proceeding, it would be a case of expropriation requiring prompt and fair compensation for the loss of the property.

Tourism

The Tourism industry offers the opportunity for continued economic diversification on Vancouver Island, provided the natural and scenic qualities that attract visitors to the Island are maintained, and provided a policy infrastructure is created to offer assurance for investors.

Recommendations:

1. A commercial backcountry recreation policy should allow tourism operators to obtain long-term tenures for their businesses on Crown land.

2. The Table recognizes the importance of viewscape management in all areas of Vancouver Island. Development in non-urban zones must respect the right to viewscape enjoyment and viewscape management plans be approved at the sub-regional level.

3. A coastal and shoreline policy be developed and implemented with the objective of managing coastal viewscapes.

4. Policy be developed and implemented with the objective of managing viewscapes along transportation and recreation corridors.

5. An inventory of the tourism capability of Vancouver Island, both environmental and social, be taken, and tourism activities monitored and managed so that they do not exceed the environmental and social carrying capacity of the Island.

6. A program of research, development and education be undertaken to locate and develop markets, and to inform the public of the economic opportunities available in the tourism industry.

7. Policy assuring effective management of historic and cultural sites be developed.
Outdoor Recreation

Outdoor Recreation is an expression of a relationship between people and their land that is essential to human well-being.

Recommendations:

1. Policies affecting outdoor recreation should recognize the basic human right to be in contact with the natural landscape.

2. An inventory of the outdoor recreation capability of Vancouver Island, both environmental and social, should be taken, and outdoor recreation activities monitored and managed so that they do not exceed the environmental and social carrying capacity of the Island.

3. Wherever possible, management of outdoor recreation to prevent exceeding the carrying capacity of existing recreational areas should be achieved by developing new recreational opportunities, or by improving existing areas, rather than by limiting access.

4. Policy regarding Crown land should recognize a general right of public access to Crown land for recreational purposes.

5. Policy regarding outdoor recreation should be founded on recognition that outdoor recreation experience depends on natural values.

6. Policy should be developed and implemented with the objective of managing viewscapes along transportation and recreation corridors.

Agriculture

Agriculture contributes much more to economic diversity and quality of life on Vancouver Island than would appear at first glance. It is a significant part of the Vancouver Island economy and lifestyle.

While much of the land in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) on Vancouver Island is not presently in production, it represents a very valuable asset for the future.

Agricultural land on Vancouver Island is under extreme pressure from urban expansion.

Recommendations:

1. Tax and other policies surrounding the Agricultural Land Reserve Act should be reviewed to ensure the feasibility of earning a living based on farming ALR lands.
2. Settlement planning must respect the integrity of the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR), and use appropriate buffering between lands in the ALR and the urban development. The ALR should not therefore be used to contain urban expansion nor to solely provide green space for the urban development.

3. “Right to Farm” legislation complementing the ALR Act, should be clarified and integrated with the Municipal Act to aid in the prevention of any bylaw conflicts, and strengthened to encourage sustainable farming practices.

4. The PAS should avoid private agricultural land but where it is included, appropriate and full compensation must be paid.

5. Subsistence agriculture on private land should be recognized as an acceptable activity in any land use zone.

6. Forestry is a suitable land use within the ALR, and the growing of trees, both coniferous and deciduous species, should qualify as agricultural production for provincial land tax designation.

7. Ground water protection and access rights legislation be implemented.

8. Recognize certified organic farming operations as having specific safeguard requirements which will not be compromised by adjacent land uses, particularly settlement areas.


10. Encourage programs to support food self-sufficiency.

**Aquaculture**

**Recommendations:**

1. Coastal zone management is within CORE's mandate and must be given a high priority. A concurrent federal/provincial process that parallels CORE must address coastal management issues.

2. The aquaculture industry be part of the future consensus-based coastal resource planning processes that will finalize the boundaries of the proposed Protected Area marine parks. Existing aquaculture tenures in these areas must either be recognized and accommodated within the proposed marine park or negotiations for prompt and fair compensation must be undertaken.

3. Government resources be made available for the implementation of the Minister's Aquaculture Industry Advisory Committee's recommendations.
Fishery

Fish habitat in rivers, lakes, estuaries and the marine environment is dispersed through all land use categories. As such it can only be protected by strict measures regulating forest, industrial and urban development throughout the region.

Recommendations:

1. The special character of fish habitat should be recognized through strong fisheries/forestry regulations with strict monitoring and enforcement. Regulations must be developed to protect the functioning of riparian zones on site specific basis.

2. Enforcement of such regulations should include adequate conservation enforcement staffing, and penalties substantial enough to ensure compliance.

3. Forest companies and other resource developers should be responsible for accurate identification of fish-bearing streams and fish habitat in proposed development areas, conducted by qualified personnel, certified by the government.

4. Similar development regulations should be applied to industrial, agricultural and urban development, with no negative impact on fish habitat as the guiding principle, while recognizing human needs and activities.

5. While recognizing human needs and activities, the long-term guiding principle for environmental protection should be zero pollution, defined as naturally existing background levels or no increase in ambient background levels, of rivers, streams, lakes and the marine environment. Measures should be adopted to move towards zero discharge using the best available technology.

Notwithstanding existing laws, the Province should move to protect water quality of all fish-bearing water bodies through:

a) the establishment of site-specific water quality objectives;

b) the maintenance of a practical program of monitoring for the attainment of these water quality objectives; and,

c) the remediation of water quality where it has been degraded.

6. Government resources should be made available for:

a) a problem solving forum to enable commercial fishery and aquaculture industry to discuss their conflicting foreshore activities; and

b) an environmental review of the impact of fish farms on the wild fishery with regulations developed for fish farm licensing and siting that ensure protection of wild stocks, preservation of existing commercial fisheries and adequate safe anchorages on the coast.
7. The provincial water laws should provide clear rights for adequate water flows for fish
protection and enhancement.

8. The Provincial Government should initiate legislation to promote and protect value-added fish
processing.

Settlement and Transportation

Low density urban expansion, particularly on eastern Vancouver Island, has, or will soon have,
significant negative impact on many important values, including protection of resource lands,
environmental sustainability and quality of community life.

Such expansion is inextricably linked to transportation policy.

Recommendations:

1. Legislation should be enacted both requiring and empowering municipal authorities on
Vancouver Island, particularly within the Georgia Basin, to work together to meet the
following regional policy objectives:

   a) To recognize that settlement on Vancouver Island shall not exceed the ecological and social
carrying capacity of the Island.

      The concerns identified in developing this recommendation include:
      ■ containment or management of urban growth,
      ■ management for increased greenbelt,
      ■ control of strip development along transportation corridors, and
      ■ implementation of recognized planning principles.

   b) Creation of sustainable communities (communities that provide the social, cultural and
economic opportunities that contribute to quality of life for present residents without
eroding those opportunities for future residents).

   c) Conservation of the land base, both urban and rural.

   d) Conservation of the water resource and pollution sink capabilities of the urban hinterland.

   e) Promotion of the use of renewable resources (e.g. water) at a sustainable rate.

   f) Reduction of waste and pollution outputs.

   g) Enhancement of the quality of community life.
2. Indicators of community sustainability, both environmental and economic, and indicators of quality of community life, should be developed and applied to monitor the above objectives.

3. Legislation should be enacted to specifically address the issue of urban growth management. Legislation with other purposes, such as the Agricultural Land Reserve Act, should not be relied on to contain urban growth.

4. Individuals and communities should be encouraged, possibly through an incentive package, to make efficient use of motorized transportation systems.

5. The role of the E and N Railway within a regional settlement and transportation strategy should be considered.

Implementation

These recommendations address how the Vancouver Island Land Use Plan (the Plan) should be implemented in fairness to all affected interests in the future.

Roles for Provincial, Regional and Sub-Regional Tables

Recommendations:

1. To promote efficiency and continuity, the Table recommends that the sectors involved in the present process be kept informed during the implementation of the Plan.

2. Continued involvement of the present sectors as the Plan is implemented should not be used as a means for excluding other, presently unrepresented, interests from participating in future changes to the Plan.

3. The Table's functions (if convened) once the Plan is accepted should be:
   a) to monitor implementation, monitoring and enforcement of the Plan at a regional level;
   b) to resolve regional level conflict;
   c) to clarify or improve the Plan;
   d) to be informed by related processes, both Provincial and Sub-regional; and
   e) to advise related processes, both Provincial and Sub-regional.

4. Sub-regional processes should be created as soon as possible, with the following objectives:
   a) to examine the land affected by the regional plan at a finer scale, and to make sub-regional land use recommendations within the framework provided by the plan;
   b) to resolve conflicts arising out of implementation of the Plan at a sub-regional level:
c) to oversee implementation, monitoring, and enforcement of the Plan at the sub-regional level;
d) to be informed by the Table;
e) to have input into the allocation of funds for resource reinvestment and transition; and
f) Sub-regional processes, sponsored by the Commissioner, will respect the principle of full representation of affected interests.

5. Where a resource affected by land use decisions has a significant aspect extending beyond the Vancouver Island region, a Province-wide interest-based shared decision-making process should be established to participate in planning for that resource. Sub-regional processes should take into account province-wide interests such as fisheries to ensure adequate participation.

Review and Amendment

1. The Plan should be considered a “rolling” plan that will need refinement as events unfold in the future.

2. As the Plan is being implemented, a timetable should be created for its improvement.

3. The Table should be reconvened and/or the Plan be revisited when the Commissioner decides, either on his/her own initiative or upon application by an interest affected by the Plan.

4. CORE should recommend significant changes to the Plan only after consultation with an interest-based shared decision-making process.

Implementation, Monitoring and Enforcement

1. Implementation of the Plan should be timely. Where a significant delay is anticipated, interim action should be taken to safeguard interests placed at risk by the delay.

2. Implementation, monitoring and enforcement of the Plan must be carried out by the government. However, their efforts should be overseen both by the appropriate interest-based process and an independent auditor.

3. To support monitoring of the Plan, comprehensive inventories of all significant environmental and resource values should be developed and maintained.

4. Monitoring should be effected by developing and applying as soon as possible an integrated set of indicators of environmental, social and economic sustainability, including, an index of Sustainable Economic Welfare, for example, the Daly/Cobb model, an Ecological Footprint analysis, and a set of pollution and resource accounts. Many other sets of indicators such as indicators of biodiversity, pollution, and community health need to be developed in a timely manner.
5. The results of evaluating those indicators should be available to the public, as well as to those charged with overseeing and auditing the monitoring process.

6. Implementation or monitoring plans and documents, or an executive summary of them, should be available to the public, and should be made as clear and non-technical as possible.

7. Legislation should be enacted to provide appropriate protection to a person reporting in good faith an infraction of any statute or regulation.

8. Organized labor/industry/environment committees should be full participants in the monitoring process and there needs to be a certification process for the members of the committee.

9. An independent agency such as the Office of the Ombudsman should acquire the responsibility of ensuring the attainment of the goals of intergenerational equity.
September 12, 1995

Mae Burrows
7798 Stanley Street
Burnaby, British Columbia
V5E 1V8

Dear Ms Burrows:

Attached is a compilation of disbursements made to participants of the Vancouver Island Regional Process.

We hope you find this information useful.

Yours truly,

Maureen Partington
Administrative Clerk

Attachment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>TOTAL $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currie, B.</td>
<td>93-07-21</td>
<td>2,705.89</td>
<td>VIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie, B.</td>
<td>93-12-02</td>
<td>994.67</td>
<td>VIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie, B.</td>
<td>93-12-08</td>
<td>516.44</td>
<td>VIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie, B.</td>
<td>94-01-06</td>
<td>941.69</td>
<td>VIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie, B.</td>
<td>94-01-31</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>VIA</td>
<td>6,668.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbesen, Saul</td>
<td>92-12-21</td>
<td>102.40</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbesen, Saul</td>
<td>93-01-07</td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbesen, Saul</td>
<td>93-10-07</td>
<td>1,575.00</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbesen, Saul (Island Hall Beach Resort)</td>
<td>93-01-25</td>
<td>83.95</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brauer, K.</td>
<td>93-10-21</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, L.</td>
<td>94-02-17</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, George</td>
<td>92-11-10</td>
<td>224.81</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths, D.</td>
<td>94-02-21</td>
<td>569.38</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, S.</td>
<td>92-12-21</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, S.</td>
<td>93-07-01</td>
<td>3,063.34</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, S.</td>
<td>93-07-19</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, S.</td>
<td>93-12-17</td>
<td>1,102.05</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, S.</td>
<td>93-12-23</td>
<td>2,431.58</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, S. (Island Hall Beach Resort)</td>
<td>93-01-25</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, Susan</td>
<td>92-12-10</td>
<td>119.52</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, Susan</td>
<td>93-02-08</td>
<td>3,989.13</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, Susan</td>
<td>93-02-22</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvenstot, Susan</td>
<td>93-07-02</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopwood, D.</td>
<td>92-11-25</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopwood, D.</td>
<td>93-01-13</td>
<td>360.89</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Dan</td>
<td>92-12-21</td>
<td>112.64</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fane, H.</td>
<td>93-05-25</td>
<td>255.70</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, George (Island Hall Beach Resort)</td>
<td>93-01-25</td>
<td>78.55</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senez, P.</td>
<td>94-01-04</td>
<td>787.62</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of Western Canada</td>
<td>94-04-12</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simms, Leigh</td>
<td>93-10-19</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrie, R. Bruce</td>
<td>93-01-13</td>
<td>77.30</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Island Conservation Sector</td>
<td>93-10-04</td>
<td>3,335.09</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Conservation Sector</td>
<td>93-04-06</td>
<td>2,656.20</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Conservation Sector</td>
<td>93-07-20</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Conservation Sector</td>
<td>94-02-11</td>
<td>1,037.92</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Conservation Sector</td>
<td>94-03-23</td>
<td>4,331.60</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCWC</td>
<td>93-01-07</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCWC</td>
<td>93-01-07</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wight, Jim</td>
<td>92-12-21</td>
<td>23.54</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wight, Jim</td>
<td>92-12-21</td>
<td>60.12</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>47,016.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Susan</td>
<td>93-04-26</td>
<td>635.01</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, D.</td>
<td>93-12-10</td>
<td>915.18</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, D.</td>
<td>94-01-07</td>
<td>594.09</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, Donna</td>
<td>93-04-19</td>
<td>2,443.27</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, Donna</td>
<td>93-07-02</td>
<td>2,874.95</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, Donna</td>
<td>93-09-01</td>
<td>2,327.94</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, Donna</td>
<td>93-10-07</td>
<td>1,211.95</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, Donna</td>
<td>93-12-10</td>
<td>982.36</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, Donna</td>
<td>93-10-07</td>
<td>1,211.95</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane, D.</td>
<td>94-01-11</td>
<td>1,480.84</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>14,677.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP W -siem Region CORE</td>
<td>93-09-27</td>
<td>6,518.32</td>
<td>VIFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm, Energy, Paperworkers Union of Canada</td>
<td>93-04-21</td>
<td>5,167.25</td>
<td>VIFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>SECTOR</td>
<td>TOTAL $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm, Energy, Paperworkers Union of Canada</td>
<td>94-01-12</td>
<td>2,340.00</td>
<td>VIFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA-Canada Local 1-425</td>
<td>94-01-12</td>
<td>657.04</td>
<td>VIFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA-Canada Local 1-85</td>
<td>93-11-02</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>VIFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pederson, Sy</td>
<td>92-12-22</td>
<td>111.52</td>
<td>VIFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhayes, R.</td>
<td>93-12-17</td>
<td>829.11</td>
<td>VIFE</td>
<td>25,213.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, K.</td>
<td>93-12-02</td>
<td>1,940.27</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ken</td>
<td>93-03-09</td>
<td>5,206.19</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ken</td>
<td>93-03-18</td>
<td>3,917.53</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ken</td>
<td>93-04-20</td>
<td>821.68</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ken</td>
<td>93-09-02</td>
<td>5,717.81</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ken</td>
<td>93-10-04</td>
<td>3,598.00</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ken</td>
<td>93-10-12</td>
<td>2,696.51</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ken</td>
<td>93-11-26</td>
<td>4,954.20</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ken</td>
<td>93-12-10</td>
<td>604.69</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Norman</td>
<td>93-01-07</td>
<td>54.60</td>
<td>VIFI</td>
<td>29,511.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne, B.</td>
<td>93-03-03</td>
<td>1,543.50</td>
<td>VIFMM</td>
<td>1,543.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>93-12-23</td>
<td>3,346.42</td>
<td>VIGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>94-01-12</td>
<td>2,669.18</td>
<td>VIGE</td>
<td>6,016.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC &amp; Yukon Chamber of Mines</td>
<td>92-11-25</td>
<td>352.73</td>
<td>VIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC &amp; Yukon Chamber of Mines</td>
<td>93-04-19</td>
<td>1,843.80</td>
<td>VIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC &amp; Yukon Chamber of Mines</td>
<td>93-04-19</td>
<td>1,843.80</td>
<td>VIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC &amp; Yukon Chamber of Mines</td>
<td>93-04-19</td>
<td>3,101.04</td>
<td>VIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC &amp; Yukon Chamber of Mines</td>
<td>93-07-30</td>
<td>3,374.23</td>
<td>VIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC &amp; Yukon Chamber of Mines</td>
<td>94-01-12</td>
<td>269.88</td>
<td>VIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cann, Jack</td>
<td>94-01-27</td>
<td>258.40</td>
<td>VIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKnight, Bruce</td>
<td>93-07-20</td>
<td>1,019.95</td>
<td>VIM</td>
<td>11,761.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embleton, Tony</td>
<td>92-12-21</td>
<td>110.72</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council</td>
<td>93-03-30</td>
<td>1,191.81</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council</td>
<td>93-09-01</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council</td>
<td>93-09-27</td>
<td>5,877.16</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council</td>
<td>93-12-07</td>
<td>2,625.00</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council</td>
<td>94-01-04</td>
<td>1,543.63</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council</td>
<td>94-02-11</td>
<td>582.42</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council of BC</td>
<td>93-03-16</td>
<td>3,228.38</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council of BC</td>
<td>93-03-16</td>
<td>6,669.50</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Council of BC</td>
<td>93-04-26</td>
<td>2,503.69</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreational Council</td>
<td>93-12-09</td>
<td>1,983.67</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreational Council</td>
<td>93-12-09</td>
<td>5,123.68</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilman, R.</td>
<td>93-07-19</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>VIR</td>
<td>38,197.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-04-05</td>
<td>11,024.66</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-04-06</td>
<td>1,265.39</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-07-01</td>
<td>2,255.53</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-07-01</td>
<td>4,028.75</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-07-13</td>
<td>1,564.45</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-10-19</td>
<td>1,817.60</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-12-02</td>
<td>1,996.97</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-12-02</td>
<td>950.07</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-12-08</td>
<td>2,507.56</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-12-10</td>
<td>275.91</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-12-16</td>
<td>149.50</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-12-17</td>
<td>669.89</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, M.</td>
<td>93-12-23</td>
<td>2,128.36</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, Myrtle</td>
<td>93-08-03</td>
<td>4,577.53</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, Myrtle</td>
<td>93-09-02</td>
<td>3,449.81</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebert, Myrtle</td>
<td>93-09-13</td>
<td>2,305.88</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>SECTOR</td>
<td>TOTAL $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jacques, Dennis</td>
<td>93-04-22</td>
<td>367.25</td>
<td>VISESS</td>
<td>40,835.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand, V.</td>
<td>93-12-10</td>
<td>692.73</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClure, Brian</td>
<td>93-03-09</td>
<td>2,422.98</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Assn of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-07-20</td>
<td>1,485.38</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Assn of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-10-19</td>
<td>7,296.51</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Assn of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-11-09</td>
<td>727.92</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Assn of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-11-26</td>
<td>1,708.90</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Assn of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-12-02</td>
<td>1,488.63</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Assn of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-12-03</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Assn of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-12-14</td>
<td>1,290.53</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Assn of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-01-07</td>
<td>1,406.22</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Association of Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-04-22</td>
<td>4,222.02</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Vancouver Island</td>
<td>93-10-19</td>
<td>7,296.51</td>
<td>VIT</td>
<td>30,063.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, H.</td>
<td>93-01-13</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, Heather</td>
<td>93-04-01</td>
<td>4,259.83</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, D.</td>
<td>93-12-24</td>
<td>3,562.49</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>92-11-13</td>
<td>1,950.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-02-15</td>
<td>363.04</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-02-15</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-02-17</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-02-17</td>
<td>363.04</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-02-03</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-05-11</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-07-13</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-08-23</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-08-30</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-09-08</td>
<td>101.90</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna</td>
<td>93-10-07</td>
<td>4,315.71</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna (Island Hall Beach Resort)</td>
<td>93-01-25</td>
<td>209.88</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Donna (Island Hall Beach Resort)</td>
<td>93-01-25</td>
<td>163.52</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton/Parker - Strathcona Park Lodge</td>
<td>93-04-13</td>
<td>1,730.86</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton/Parker-Paradise Sea Shell Motel</td>
<td>93-03-18</td>
<td>117.98</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Z.</td>
<td>93-01-20</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Z.</td>
<td>93-01-26</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Alison</td>
<td>93-09-01</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Sarah</td>
<td>94-07-08</td>
<td>806.00</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Sarah</td>
<td>94-07-06</td>
<td>321.20</td>
<td>VIY</td>
<td>36,028.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>TOTAL $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|                                         |        |         |             | 287,712.95 |
|                                         |        |         |             | 287,712.95 |